

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF  
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1895.

---

ARTICLE I.

THE APOSTLES' CREED AND THE MONUMENTS.

BY REV. JUNIUS B. FOX, PH. D.

The battle for the truth of Inspiration is passing over into the domain of Biblical Archaeology. The Semitic Languages, antique monuments and buildings, plastic and pictorial representations, inscriptions and coins, are being investigated to establish the authenticity and integrity of the Old Testament Scriptures. The time is coming, in necessary chronological sequence, when the faith of primitive Christianity will pass under similar critical examination and produce its strongest proofs from the department of Ecclesiastical Archaeology. Already the field is being occupied and able works by eminent scholars and discoverers have set forth the irrefragable testimony of the Christian monuments. Evidently these afford the best sources of positive evidence in the verification of the Gospel, and in furnishing an ample exposition of its meaning as held and taught in the first Christian centuries. Christian documents might be forgeries; they might be interpolated, mutilated or vitiated; but the inscriptions, symbols and records of monuments are immutable. An old ruined temple, tower, tomb, or ancient coin, if correctly interpreted, may explain some obscure point in history, verify

its written statements, settle the disputed interpretations, and refute the attacks of adverse criticism.

Ancient Christian and Pagan nations employed certain characteristic symbols, signs or tokens by which they expressed their hidden conceptions of religion, and gave their ideas of truth visible form. These were placed upon coins, gravestones and other permanent monuments, the better to preserve and teach them. Symbolism was no more than a pictorial language addressed to the mind and soul through the eye, as spoken language communicates thought through the ear. This mode of promulgating religious ideas had not only the advantage of greater vividness and impressiveness than the verbal statement, but was necessary for other considerations among the ancient nations, especially to perpetuate and maintain their convictions and dogmas.

So striking a resemblance has been observed between the Pagan and Christian symbols that a marvelous unity of religion has been discovered, showing that the faith of mankind, notwithstanding the perversions and corruptions of idolatry, has been essentially one and the same in all the ages. Indeed, the ancient Christian monuments reveal so many obvious adaptations from Pagan mythology and art that it is necessary to examine them in connection as comparisons and parallels. In this paper, we propose to trace as briefly as our limits permit the original promulgation of the Christian faith, as embodied in the Apostles' Creed, illustrating each article by condensed descriptions of the monumental records of primitive Christianity, and using such dimly shadowed counterparts in the different systems of Paganism as the case may require. The principal illustrations are from the paintings and sculpture of the catacombs at Rome, as well as in the mosaics of the earliest churches, as they are set forth in the works of the ablest archaeologists.

I. *God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.* The early Christians believed that, inasmuch as God is invisible and has no body or bodily organs, it must be a materializing of him to represent him under a bodily form. When, therefore, the early Christian artists, under the guidance and authority of

the Church, ventured to represent the Being of God the Father, it was always through the special symbols of the hand, or by the circle. Among the ancient Hindus, Persians and Egyptians, the circle was the symbol of the eternal, invisible and infinite God. Early Christian art retained this symbol, but always around Christ, or some type of him. It was, however, chiefly through the hand, that God, the Almighty Father, was represented. On some of the monuments have been found a circle containing three *Yods*—the *Yod* being the tenth or perfect number of the Hebrew alphabet, and the first letter in the name of God or Jehovah. *Yod* also means the hand, the synonym of strength and power, and hence was used by the early Christians, especially in times of the persecutions, to symbolize the power and efficiency of God. But more frequently pictures are found among the monumental remains of early Christian art, in which the Divine Hand is represented as darting forth rays of power and blessing. A very common symbol is God's Hand reaching out of heaven in merciful interposition, arresting the uplifted arm of Abraham, about to sacrifice Isaac. In other instances, the Divine Hand is shown holding a crown over the head of our Lord, as well as over the heads of the saints, as the Rewarder of Virtue. On some of the coins of Constantine, struck after his death, he is seen translated to heaven in a chariot, the hand of God reaching out to receive him. The same Hand is represented as extended from heaven to rescue the souls of the just and translate them to paradise, illustrating the passage of Scripture which says that all God's saints are in his hand, (Deut. 33 : 3). The hand is, therefore, the chief symbol employed by early Christianity to indicate the being and presence of God. Inheriting the Jewish hatred and loathing of idolatry, and still more the shocking forms and vices of Paganism, the primitive Christians attempted no pictorial or sculptured image of God the Father, and hence none are found in the earliest monuments. Even as late as the twelfth century, no portrait of God the Father is to be seen; his presence is intimated only by a hand issuing from the clouds or from heaven. God the Father as *maker of heaven and earth* is never depicted in early Christian

art. On account of the earlier development of the doctrine of the Person of Christ, less attention seems to have been given to that of creation. The clause, "Maker of heaven and earth," was not added until the sixth or seventh century. (See Schaff's Church History, Vol. II., p. 535). Moreover, the process of creation is nowhere revealed; it was only said, "He spake and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast." What is thus left a mystery in Holy Scripture, primitive Christian art was too reverent to attempt to delineate. But as the creation of Adam and Eve is described, an example as early as the fourth century occurs in a Greek ivory tablet. A copy is given in J. P. Lundy's Monumental Christianity, p. 106—a magnificent work, richly illustrated, and our principal authority on this subject. Adam is represented as fast asleep, and Eve, a beautiful young girl of fifteen or eighteen years, rises from his side, with raised hands toward the divine hand, as if engaged in worship.



If space permitted we would add a number of inscriptions and epitaphs, many of which contained the Greek letters *A* and *Ω*, denoting God the Father Almighty Creator, implying firm belief in the first Person of the Holy Trinity; but we are compelled to pass on to the second and principal article.

II. *Jesus Christ his Only Son our Lord.* The same caution of early Christian art in regard to representing God the Father under any human form prevailed in reference to the divinity of our Lord. There is total absence of any genuine and authentic portrait of Christ. Had the primitive Christians believed him to be only a man, there would have been portraits of him without end, in painting, statuary, gems and mosaics; but because he was deemed a divinity we find only types of him. There were numerous ideal representations and symbols, both painted and sculptured, as teachers and reminders of his God-like prerogatives and powers. The first and most frequently used were the Monogram, the Lamb, the Fish, the Anchor, the Lyre, the Vine, and the Palm. There are also figurative or allegorical representations of him under the forms of the Good Shepherd, Orpheus, Apollo, and other adaptations from Paganism. He



appears always as the immortal Youth, to express the idea of divinity that never grows old.

On one of the most celebrated and magnificent sarcophagi, dedicated to the memory of *Junius Bassus*, who died about A. D. 355, the youthful figure of Christ is seated on a throne, with his feet resting on a veil, bent like a bow, and held by an old man. This is evidently intended to represent Christ above, sitting enthroned in heavenly state; his feet upon the earth as his footstool. Christ appears in other forms on this remarkably elegant, costly, and beautiful monument of Parian marble, but we can not describe them here.

The ordinary and perhaps universal symbol of Christ was, however, the sacred monogram, invented and employed principally in the *Disciplina Arcani*, or the mysteries, because of the heathen persecutions and punishment of death upon using the name of Christ. It was placed upon seals, rings, bracelets, and other objects, and consisted of the combination of the first two Greek letters of the name Christ—*Chi* and *Rho*, or  inclosed in a circle. Very frequently the monogram is in this form , but means the same thing. Usually the Greek letters, *A* and *Ω* stand on opposite sides of the monogram, meaning that Christ is the first and the last of all beings.

Next to the sacred monogram, the Fish takes its place in importance as a sign of Christ in his special office as Saviour. It was an emblem or figure of Christ in his Divine presence and power in the saving ordinance of Baptism. Tertullian, in his work on *Baptism*, Chapter I, says: "But we, little fishes, after the example of our *ΙΧΘΥΣ*, Jesus Christ, are born in water, nor have we any safety in any other way than by permanently abiding in water," (The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. III., p. 669). There are two senses in which the Fish applies to Jesus Christ, first as a mere word; and second as an image or picture of Christ in the Sacraments. St. Augustine in his *City of God*, book XVIII, Chap. 23, says: "If you join together the initial letters of the five Greek words *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σοτήρ*, which mean Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour, they

will make  $\text{ΙΧΘΥΣ}$ , Fish, in which word Christ is mystically understood, because he was able to live in the abyss of this mortality as in the depth of waters, that is, without sin." De Rossi, the greatest of all the authorities on the ancient Christian monuments, says, that the Fish as a symbol belongs to the first four centuries of the Christian era, and is more especially to be referred to the times of persecution, when the Secret Discipline of the Church existed. Its use after the time of Constantine is more from custom or ornament than necessity. Christ was also represented by the Vine and the Good Shepherd, the most common and evidently popular of all the symbols on the ancient monuments,—the one the type of joy, the other of protection to his chosen followers. The Catacombs are full of these symbols, sometimes in combination; some of them dating back, according to the best authorities, to the second century. There are also numerous parallel Pagan types—*Krishna, Mithras, Horus, Apollo, and Orpheus*—of which Christ is evidently the only archetype and antitype.

III. *Who was Conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary.* Christian art begins its treatment of the Nativity with an elegant painting representing the divine annunciation to the Virgin Mary. It is a fresco in the cemetery of Priscilla and belongs to the last half of the first century. A young woman of maidenly purity, modesty and innocence, sits in a chair of royal state, with veiled head, downcast eye and uplifted hand, as if in the very ecstasy of wonder, perplexity and astonishment at the announcement made her by the majestic youthful figure standing before her, emphasizing his message, and pointing out his hand, as the messenger of God. The two figures are surrounded by beautiful wreaths and garlands, while the doves in the angles indicate the presence of the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, and divine agent in the generation of our Lord's humanity. In other paintings there are representations of the visitation of Mary to Elizabeth, clasping each other in their arms; the three Magi presenting their gifts; the Holy Child, seated on a throne, the characteristic eight-pointed star above, while Mary, Joseph, the Wise Men, the shepherds and

angels are all adoring him. In every instance, the Child is the central figure and sole object of supreme regard. There is not a single example or indication in ancient Christian art of the Madonna, or the later *Mariolatry* of the Roman Catholic Church. Some eminent men, discovering this fact, in the study of monumental Christianity, have been converted from Roman Catholicism.

The question has recently been raised by the reading of the newly discovered Sinaitic Gospel manuscript, whether Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and whether Mary was at the time of the annunciation a virgin. A writer in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Berlin, who claims to be a Christian, is quoted in the *Literary Digest*, (Dec. 29, 1894) as saying: "The reason why the formula of the Apostolic Creed may be regarded as open to objections is simply that the text of the New Testament Scriptures is, in many places, irreconcilable with the Creed, and it may, therefore, be doubted whether the authorities of early Christianity believed in the Immaculate Conception. The life of Jesus as we find it recorded in the Gospels, as well as the sayings of the apostles, especially St. Paul, allow us to believe that the first Christian generation accepted Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary." Without pausing to examine the Scripture passages cited to support this view, we can only say, in passing, that the testimony of all the Christian monuments, yet discovered, and some of them carrying us back to the days of the apostles, unanimously and irrefutably prove the belief in the divine conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost. The testimony of the monuments is, moreover, corroborated by that of the Church Fathers, Justin the Martyr, Irenaeus, and others. This doctrine became so thoroughly established, that the Council at Ephesus, A. D. 431, applied to the Virgin Mary, the epithet, *Theotokos*, Mother of God. So far as the documentary evidence on this point is concerned, the writings of St. Ignatius, Second Bishop of Antioch (A. D. 70-107), ought to be sufficient to prove the faith of "the first Christian generation." "He attaches great importance to the flesh, that is, the full reality of the human nature of Christ, his true birth from the virgin, and

his crucifixion under Pontius Pilate; he calls him God incarnate" (*ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός*). Schaff's History Christian Church, Vol. II., p. 556.

The parallel representations of the birth of heathen deities from virgins are very striking and remarkable, as Isus and Horus of the Egyptians, Mylitta and Tammuz of the Babylonians, Vishnu and Lakshmi of the Hindus, Juno Lucina and child in ancient Italy, but a satisfactory description would require a separate article. They are interesting only as affording precious witness for the glory and truth of the Christian faith, which they dimly foreshadow and contain.

IV. *Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified, Dead and Buried.* There were two distinct modes in ancient Christian art of representing the personal appearance of our Lord. Inspiration is silent, except some conflicting prophetic anticipations, and hence uniformity in the paintings of the early Christians could hardly be expected. Sometimes the Saviour is pictured young and beautiful; again, he has a sad face, covered with beard, in which he appears really and literally "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." "The youthful Divinity was first and longest used, even down to the tenth century, when the sadness and gloom of the age, consequent of the general belief that the end of the world was near, preferred the man of sorrows hanging upon the Cross." (Lundy's Monumental Christianity, p. 231). There is not a single instance, however, in the early Christian monuments, in which the subject of the Crucifixion is presented. In a sculptured sarcophagus of the fourth century, Christ appears a majestic figure before Pilate, with a lamb beside him, in which the idea of sacrifice is connected with our Lord's trial before the Roman governor. It was a most delicate and artistic way of just hinting at the Crucifixion without giving any glimpse of its humiliation and horror. For crucifixion was a most shameful and degrading thing, most keenly felt by Christ himself, in which feeling early Christianity fully shared, and which required seven centuries to overcome. Pontius Pilate is mentioned in the Creed merely to designate the time of our Lord's passion, hence not many paintings of him could be

expected, especially in connection with a subject so repugnant to the emotions of the ancient Christians, many of whom willingly suffered as martyrs for Christ. Those heroic believers wished to make their κοιμητήρια, *sleeping places*, cheerful, inspiring and hopeful; symbolical of the heavenly world; hence there was a careful abstaining in Christian art from all painful representations of Christ, in his state of suffering and humiliation.

From the first age of Christianity, however, the passion of our Lord was exhibited under the form of the Paschal Lamb, an ever recurring symbol in the Catacombs and the mosaics of churches. The victorious Lamb was represented usually as occupying a central place within a circle of garlands, having a diadem or nimbus on its head, and as being a symbol of him who takes away the sin of the world, used by early Christians in times of persecution and danger for the instruction of the catechumens and neophytes, when a crucifix would have been hazardous and indecorous. The St. Andrew's crosses are seen in the corners, suggestive of suffering, and a crown on the head of the lamb is emblematic of victory. The circle, in which the lamb stands, denotes the eternity of God the Father. There are other mosaics in which is shown the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, emblematic of his universal Church. Down to the eighth century the lamb was exclusively used to symbolize Christ as the Saviour, slain for the sins of men, and triumphant over sin, Satan, and death. But the Second Trullan Council, convened by Emperor Justinian II, A. D. 692, ordained that henceforth the actual figure of the historic Christ should be used in all church paintings and mosaics instead of the lamb, as in former times. Hence we have a fresco of the ninth century in which Christ is seen hanging upon the cross, with Mary and John standing on either side. It was reserved for later ages to inaugurate the supremacy of the worshiped crucifix. The earliest example of our Lord's burial which exists among the monuments of primitive Christianity is of the sixth century, an

ivory in the Vatican, which represents a square structure, surmounted by a dome, with a sleeping soldier on each side of it, and two of the holy women who came early in the morning to anoint the dead body of their Lord. No such representations are found, however, in the Catacombs or the early churches, either of the East or of the West. It is a significant hint of the hopeful and joyful eschatology which characterized the early Christians, and exhibits most forcibly the glorious hopes which strengthened them in times of poverty, distress, persecution and death.

V. *He descended into Hell; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* The clause, *descendit ad inferna*, is not found in the Creed before the latter part of the fourth century. The heresy of Apollinarius, who denied that our Lord had a man's rational soul, was condemned on all sides, and finally by the General Council that met at Constantinople in A. D. 381. Hitherto no necessity had existed for the special statement of this doctrine, since nobody had ever before doubted or denied it. It was the common belief of all Christendom from the beginning. It is too explicitly taught in the Scriptures to be gain-said or overlooked, and early Christianity has recorded its understanding and explanation of the matter in its monuments. The norm of this doctrine for the first ages seems to have been the words of our Lord himself: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas; for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whales belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," (St. Matt. 12 : 39, 40). Jonah, then, is a type of Christ who descended into hell, and rose from the dead on the third day. Every student of the Catacombs knows that there is no subject, not even excepting the Good Shepherd, so frequently represented there as that of Jonah. It occurs in every variety of fresco, sculpture, funeral tablet, glass, lamp, medallion, etc., as a type of death and the resurrection. Of a vast number of instances,

we can mention only one—a beautiful fresco of the second or third century in a series of four pictures, in which Jonah is represented as cast into the sea, swallowed by the whale or Etruscan hippocampus, disgorged upon the land, then overlooking Nineveh, and finally resting under the luxuriant gourd. (Lundy's *Monumental Christianity*, p. 257, exhibits the picture).

It is a singular and remarkable fact that the early Christian monuments do not contain a scene of the actual resurrection of Christ. A fact so dear to the faith and hope of the primitive martyrs, confessors and believers, was however often represented under a variety of forms of types and symbols. The illustration of Jonah was used not only to set forth the descent into hell, but also the resurrection of Christ and of his faithful disciples. Samson carrying of the gates of Gaza, and defeating the Philistines by his own death, was considered a type of Christ bursting open and carrying away the gates of Hades, and conquering his enemies by his death and resurrection. Isaac, too, was a type of our Lord's resurrection, because he was the same as dead, and restored to his father alive. Daniel, also, standing between two lions, subdued and tamed, was a special type of Christ, overcoming sin and death. All these scenes, with the Tree of Life, and others setting forth the same belief, prove beyond conjecture the doctrine of Christ's resurrection as held and maintained by our first Christian fathers.

In some striking sculptures and frescos of the second, third and fourth centuries, Christ is pictured instructing his Apostles, and the four Evangelists, and even his ascension into heaven, in which Elijah is used as the type. These were found in the cemetery of St. Calixtus, the most prominent of all the Roman Catacombs, because it contained the bodies of the Roman Bishops. "That of St. Calixtus was the burial vault of the Bishops of Rome in the third century, and it is therefore probable that *this* Catacomb was exclusively Christian," (Parker's *Archaeology of Rome*, Vol. XII., on *The Catacombs*, p. 12—an exceedingly valuable work with photographs of the Catacombs taken by the author with use of magnesium light.)

The *sitting at the right hand of God* is shown in the numerous



instances, in which our Lord is seen in royal apparel seated on the throne of his glory, with angels standing to do his bidding ; but there is no Virgin Mary. In the old Basilica of St. Paul at Rome, A. D. 441, representing the Apocalyptic vision of St. John, our Lord Jesus is seen on his heavenly throne, surrounded by the sea of glass, the bow of the covenant, the mystic beasts, the white-robed elders with their crowns, and the whole heavenly host adoring him.

The general resurrection will be considered under the third Article of the Creed, and the clause on the Final Judgment is reserved until that subject comes under review.

VI. *The Holy Ghost ; the Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints.* We have seen how the Holy Ghost is the author of Christ's human nature through his incarnation of the Virgin Mary. We are now to see how he is the life-giving power in the Church and in the sacraments. The universal symbol of the Holy Spirit, among civilized and religious nations, is the Dove. Among many pagan nations it was regarded as particularly sacred ; a messenger of the deity ; an emblem of peace and good fortune. From the very first origin of Christian art, the dove appears in fresco paintings, sculptures, on gravestones or tablets, in mosaics, lamps, and glasses. It appears in all the representations of the Annunciation, Nativity, Baptism, the Good Shepherd, Christ and his Apostles, and always with Noah. The frequent occurrence of the symbol is evidently the result of the Scriptural image of the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove. As the agent in Creation, as the source of divine inspiration, as indicating God's presence in the Church and his sanctifying power in the Sacraments, the dove is the prevailing symbol of the third person of the Trinity, in all the early Christian monuments.

The Holy Christian or Catholic Church is represented in three ways. One is the typical ark of Noah ; another is that of a ship ; and the third an Orante, or praying female, typifying the Bride of Christ. Not only the monuments, but all the Fathers of the early Church, who mention the subject at all, speak of Noah's ark as a symbol of the Church. Tertullian, in his treatise



tise on Idolatry, chap. XXIV., says: "We will see to it, if, after the type of the ark, there shall be in the Church, raven, kite, dog and serpent. At all events, an idolater is not found in the type of the ark; no animal has been fashioned to represent an idolater. Let not that be in the Church which was not in the ark." (Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. III., p. 76). St. Augustine says: "Noah's ark built for the preservation of his family and the animals is certainly a figure or type of the City of God sojourning in this world, *i. e.*, of the Church." (*City of God*, Book XV., chap. 26). Similar explicit quotations might be cited from other Fathers. No wonder, then, that early Christian art, on all its monuments, adopted the ark as the prevailing symbol of the Church, the depository, defender, and expounder of divine truth as contained in the Holy Scriptures, and as the preserver of the life-giving grace and power of the Sacraments, and as promulgated by the Christian ministry.

The *ship* of ancient Christian art differs from the ark in being crescent-shaped, is equipped with sails, and does not contain the peculiar square box, in which Noah is standing. About each, however, in various positions, one or more doves hover and rest. A picture of the third century displays a crescent-shaped boat, resting on the back of a huge fish, the emblem, as we have seen, of Christ; the foundation of the Church. A dove sits on the stern as the symbol of the Holy Spirit, giving wisdom and encouragement to the helmsman, toward whom it is directly looking, while another dove perches on the sail as the symbol of peace and safety. Peter, whose name appears above his head, has left the boat, and is kneeling on the water before his Lord, who keeps him from sinking. In the same picture appear the Greek letters *IHS*; the first letters of the name of Jesus. In some instances a light-house and the Christian monogram appear in connection with the ship. The *Orante*, also associated frequently with the ark and ship, and always with arms extended in the attitude of prayer, is a heathen adaptation to symbolize the Church as the Bride of Christ.

The phrase, *The Communion of Saints*, is of very late introduction into the Creed. Its earliest known appearance is about

A. D. 550. No other clause appears, or was accepted later, except "Maker of heaven and earth." The early Christians evidently believed in the Communion of Saints, as is proven not only by the writings of the Fathers, but in their pictorial representations of the Agape and Eucharist. Frescos and mosaics of each of these scenes are of common occurrence in the Catacombs and the ancient monuments, some of them as early as the second century. Their celebration on the anniversaries of the death of believers and at their graves seems to indicate that the early Christians believed in the Communion of Saints as something more than the Holy Christian or Catholic Church. These days, usually celebrated in honor of the martyrs, were called *natalitia*, or birth days, because the saints were "born to heaven from the world." The monumental inscriptions of subterranean Rome, of which De Rossi has collected and classified an immense number, give similar indication of this early conception of the *Sanctorum Communio*. Among these inscriptions we have such as these: *Pete pro nobis*; *Pete pro parentibus*; *Pete pro conjuge*; *Pete pro filiis*. "Pray for us; pray for parents; for husband or wife; for children."

There are also paintings and mosaics revealing the doctrine, as Melchisedek in the act of offering bread and wine, the marriage supper and the wise virgins, symbols of Christ and the Eucharist, Christ on the shore of the sea of Galilee with the Disciples and the loaves and fishes, and numerous Agapae, or love feasts. Neither the monuments nor the ancient Liturgies favor the interpretation of the Communion of Saints as the Holy Christian Church, and therefore do not sustain the punctuation with the comma, but with a period, colon or semi-colon. The belief of early Christianity, however, can no more determine or decide this question than the practice of the early Church settles the mode of Baptism. The late introduction of the phrase, "the Communion of Saints," shows that in the early ages, it was a matter of secondary consideration.

VII. *The forgiveness of sins.* The doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is represented in primitive Christian art in the administration of Baptism and the Absolution of the Church in

the name and authority of Christ. The subjects of Baptism, from the earliest ages of Christianity, have been infants as well as adults, as proven by the concurrent testimony of the ancient documents and monuments. Irenaeus says: "Being thirty years old, Christ came to be baptized; he came to save all through himself—all, I say, who through him are born again unto God, infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men." Origen expressly says that "the baptism of infants at the breast was an apostolical tradition." "Among the Fathers, Tertullian himself not excepted—for he combats only its expediency—there is not a single voice against the lawfulness and the apostolic origin of infant baptism." (Schaff's *Hist. of the Christian Church*, Vol. II., p. 259). The ancient monuments represent both infant and adult baptism for the remission of sins, and the communication of the Holy Ghost.

As to the mode, both the documents and monuments favor nude trine immersion. It was not, however, the universal mode, and there are numerous instances of aspersion, especially in the case of infants and where the quantity of water was not convenient. The Baptism of Christ, one of the most celebrated and popular frescos, belonging to the ninth century according to J. H. Parker, represents Christ as standing in the Jordan up to his waist in water in which fishes are swimming, and at which a hart is drinking, while John the Baptist is standing on the bank and pouring water on his head. This is the general mode, and indicates sprinkling, but Tertullian says: "It is not only once, but three times, that we are dipped into the Three Persons, in the use of the three names." (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III., p. 623). In ancient times the baptized were immediately confirmed, and this is doubtless the explanation of the imposition of hands by the clergy while the candidate is standing in the water.

There are numerous paintings of the fall of our first parents as the cause of sin. Adam and Eve appear together under the fatal tree, encircled with the serpent, but there is only one instance discovered in which Eve is receiving the forbidden fruit. This scene in the first Paradise has many remarkable counter-

parts in heathen mythology. But the early monuments of Christianity show not only the cause but the absolution of sin. Wherever the Orante, symbolizing the Bride of Christ, appears, she stands with wide extended arms as a loving mother to pronounce her absolution and receive her penitent and lapsed children. Everywhere in the rich heritage of early Christian art, repentance and remission of sins through the holy sacraments is preached to poor contrite, sin-sick souls, while the blessed assurance of the Gospel is sealed and confirmed in the absolution of the Church, to which were committed the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

VIII. *The resurrection of the body; And the life everlasting.* The Royal Good Shepherd, who gave his life for the Sheep, is perhaps the favorite symbol of ancient Christian art. A beautiful fresco of the second century represents him with a lamb on his shoulders, standing between two trees, surrounded by an octagon, and the octagon by a square, and the square by a circle. This popular symbol of Christ and this combination of geometrical figures must have some meaning beyond the purpose of mere adornment. The circle is the symbol of God and the heavenly world; the square doubtless typifies this world; and the octagon, which is the union and combination of both very probably represents Christ as the God-Man, the bond of union between the heavenly and earthly worlds.

But not only through the chief symbol of the Good Shepherd, the early monuments represent the resurrection of the body in the frequent pictures of the resurrection of Lazarus. There is a striking portrait of Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, in which our Lord appears a noble young personage raising the dead, some of whom are just starting into life, and two are already seen in their pristine innocence. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is proven to be a part of the Creed of the ancient Church also by the monumental inscriptions or epitaphs, some fifteen thousand of which have been collected and classified, all breathing strong Christian hope in a blissful heavenly re-union.

There are but two examples yet discovered of the Final Judg-

ment, and both of these refer to the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden as a type of the future and Last Judgment. The invariable purpose seems to have been to exclude from the final resting-places of the dead anything of a distressing or gloomy character. Where Christ is pictured as Judge in Eden, in one of the paintings just mentioned, he has a youthful smiling countenance.

The doctrine of the life everlasting was depicted on the early monuments in the marriage of Cupid and Psyche; the Phoenix; and the Peacock, all adaptations from heathenism, which the first Christians did not hesitate to employ in the sense in which they conceived the perverted truths of Paganism. Cupid and Psyche are painted on the drinking cups used in the Agapae and Eucharistic celebrations of the Divine Love to man, and would signify the union of the soul with Christ, and its final union with him in heaven. There are also frescos on the Christian monuments at Rome in which Cupid and Psyche are represented as gathering the flowers of Heaven. In the same sense the fabled Phoenix and the Peacock were employed to exhibit the Christian belief in the future life. De Rossi and others have discovered many examples of them in the Christian centuries at Rome. They can be nothing else but symbols of immortality.

From this cursory examination of the monumental evidence of ancient Christianity, we make the following deductions:

1. That the principal and essential elements of faith and Religion are the same in all the ages.
2. That there is an observable unity of religion, under various modifications, perversions, corruptions and developments, indicating a common origin, very probably God's primitive revelation.
3. That Christianity is a clearer, simpler, purer, and more rational embodiment of religious thought and reality, than any other system of belief.
4. That the Church is contemporaneous and co-extensive with Christianity.
5. That the Church is one and the same in every age, and must have the same author.
6. That both Christianity and the Church must abide for all time, and finally be merged into the Church Triumphant.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE CENTRAL PRINCIPLE OF LUTHERANISM.

BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

Lutheranism considered as a *Confession*, is not a haphazard or accidental congeries of doctrines, each independent of and unrelated to the other, but a system regulated by its own fundamental principle, which makes it unique as a *form* of Christianity, and different from other forms into which Christianity has been cast. Romanism is dominated by the Church-principle. Calvinism is dominated by the Predestination-principle. With Romanism and Calvinism Lutheranism has much in common, especially is there substantial agreement in the doctrine of the Trinity and in Christology. All three Confessions accept the decisions of the first six general councils, and lay equal emphasis on the *Western* form of the Nicene Creed, which, without doubt, contains the most vital, the most essential, the most characteristic doctrines of Christianity. The idea of God is fundamental and vital to all religion, since religion, objectively considered, is man's conception of his relations to God. But that which more than anything else differentiates the Christian religion from all other religions, is the trinitarian conception embodied in the Nicene Creed. The holding of this conception of God in a way that is substantially identical makes Romanism, Calvinism and Lutheranism one to a degree not often sufficiently recognized. But after this the three systems begin to part company, and by the time they reach the Application of Redemption they are in many respects wide apart. As against Romanism, Lutheranism and Calvinism maintain that the word of God alone can make articles of faith; and they lay down the principle that "the Sacred Scripture is its own legitimate interpreter: and avow the perspicuity of Sacred Scripture, which makes an exegetico-dogmatic tribunal superfluous," (*Winer's Confessions*, p. 53). Tradition, which is placed by Romanism on an equal footing with

sacred scripture (*Council of Trent, Fourth Session*), is entirely rejected by Lutheranism and Calvinism as authoritative in matters of doctrine and practice in Christianity. In the doctrines of sin and grace Lutheranism and Calvinism stand substantially together as against Romanism. The two former regard sin as a deep radical corruption of human nature which cuts off from communion with God and brings temporal and eternal death. (*See Schmalk. Art., pt. III., and Westm. Con., Chap. VI.*) According to Romanism sin is to be regarded chiefly as a diminution of the moral powers of man, as an infirmity left by original sin and by the "prevarication" of Adam. Concupiscence is not sin. Romanism conceives of grace as divine assistance which helps man back into the favor of God. Lutheranism and Calvinism regard grace as a truly divine goodness and favor exercised towards the ill-deserving for the purpose of *overcoming* their antagonism to righteousness by free love—with the difference that according to Lutheranism grace is designed for all, and is *resistible*, but according to Calvinism it is exercised only upon the elect and is *irresistible*.

But the most fundamental difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism on the one hand and Romanism on the other, is the doctrine of the Church. With the latter the Church is an external organism constituted under the Pope as the visible head, and is the mediatrix of salvation. *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*. Only he who is united with the Church, that is, the Church of Rome, will be saved. With Lutheranism and Calvinism the Church is in essence a congregation of true believers. *Extra Christum nulla salus*. Membership with the Church is conditioned by membership with Christ, for only he who truly belongs to Christ, belongs truly to the Church. The Church is a spiritual body which manifests itself in visible organization, and only secondarily is she an institution of salvation.\*

\*Already in the year 1521 Luther, commenting on Matt. 16: 18, wrote: *Igitur sicut petra ista sine peccato invisibilis et spiritualis est, sola fide perceptibilis, ita necesse est et ecclesiam sine peccato invisibilem et spirituales sola fide perceptibilem esse. Oportet enim fundamentum esse cum aedificio ejusdem conditionis, sicut dicimus: Credo ecclesiam sanctam catholicam, at fides est rerum non apparentium. Erl. Lat., var. 5, 295.*



Lutheranism and Calvinism are also at one in teaching that faith is absolutely necessary to the efficacy of a sacrament, as against the *opus operatum*. Only he who believes the word of the sacrament, has the grace of the sacrament.

From these preliminary observations it is evident that we are not to seek the central, determining principle of Lutheranism in any of the doctrines mentioned. In that doctrine that forms the basal conception of Christianity, that is, in what may be called the *Hauptartikel* of the Christian religion, viz., the doctrine of the Trinity, Romanism, Lutheranism and Calvinism are at one. In the doctrines of the Scripture, sin, grace, the Church, faith, Lutheranism and Calvinism show a substantial consensus. Even justification by faith alone is not a distinguishing doctrine of the Lutheran Church. Calvinism affirms it unqualifiedly, and many Calvinistic theologians have taught it in a way entirely acceptable to Lutherans. But the difference arises from the position which the doctrine holds in the respective systems. Indeed it is this position of justification which chiefly, if not entirely, makes them different systems. Calvinism starts with the absoluteness and the absolute sovereignty of God. This issues in making the absolute decree the starting point, the determining principle of Calvinism. Every doctrine must be viewed in the light of the principle, and must have its value assigned it in the economy of redemption according as it bears relation to the absolute decree. Out of the doctrine of the absolute causality of God, comes the double predestination, nothing determining God thereto except his own most sovereign will—the decree unto life, election; and the decree unto condemnation, reprobation; for the event must have its explanation in the cause. That some men are elected, is due solely to God's will expressing itself in grace; that some men are lost is due solely to God's will expressing itself in justice. The glory of God is the supreme end in either case—the glory of his grace and the glory of his justice. In a word Calvinism starts above with God in an *a priori* conception and comes down to man. It is a deductive system based on a metaphysical postulate. To this it owes its



logical coherence. He who accepts its fundamental hypothesis cannot well avoid its remotest conclusion.

Lutheranism has a different principle, and a different method. It starts with the sin and misery of man as a fact of experience. Its supreme concern is not with the glory of God, but with the rescue of man out of his wretched and lost condition. It is born out of the cry: "What must I do to be saved?" and the answer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." He who makes this cry in the distress and anguish of his soul, and with the heart believes the answer, is saved. Thus Lutheranism begins below with man and goes up to God. It finds the *fons et origo salutis* not in the *decretum Dei*, but in the depths of the divine compassion. The system is inductive. It may not always justify itself to the logical understanding, but it gives full satisfaction to the believing consciousness. In its essence it is the transcript of the experience of one man: Luther struggled with sin, and cried: "My sin, my sin, oh my sin!" In this cry he summed up and concentrated in himself the burdening cry of humanity. The consolation which he received from the discovery that the righteousness of God is the righteousness which God imputes in Christ, is the consolation which sin-conscious humanity is seeking. Forgiveness of sin, righteousness before God, is the deepest need, as it is the object of the deepest longing of a soul that feels the guilt of sin. The satisfaction of such need and longing is far more to the soul than the authority of the Church, or the authority of the Scriptures, or than the decrees of God, for all these things are formal. The other is material. It is the thing itself. It satisfies. It gives the experience of salvation. It brings into relation of reconciliation with God, of certainty of grace, of adoption.

This is something widely different from the "infusion of grace" of the Roman Catholic Church, or from the absolute decree of Calvinism. This places redemption in a different light. As against Romanism it is entirely objective and independent of personal righteousness. As against Calvinism it makes the righteousness that is in Christ *the* impelling external cause of redemption, not one link in a chain of causes which is anchored

finally in the arbitrary decree. This also places the doctrine of the application of redemption in a different light. In the word is the assurance as well as the instrument of redemption. He who has the word has access to redemption. The Church cannot debar him. The decree cannot cut off hope. In a word, this principle determines the view of the entire *corpus doctrinae*, and especially does it become the touchstone for testing predestination, vocation, regeneration, sanctification. Even the Church must be defined by the light of this principle; and we may say of a scripture as Luther said when writing of the Epistle of James, that it is profitable in proportion as it contains Christ, and teaches the doctrine of justification alone through Christ. Hence it is this principle which makes the Lutheran system Christocentric. As it took form in Luther's own experience it meant forgiveness of sins and perfect righteousness before God purely on account of Christ. "Christ laid hold of by faith, and dwelling in the heart, is over righteousness," or as he more accurately defines it, "Christ is imputed to us for righteousness," or as he presents its various elements in his Commentary on Galatians, I., 195: "These three things, faith, Christ and acceptance or imputation, are associated. Faith apprehends Christ and holds him present and enclosed as the ring, the diamond, and whoever shall be found with this faith in Christ apprehended by his heart, him God reputes as just. This method is the merit by which we come to the remission of sins and to righteousness."

As the principle took shape in the confession it appears as follows: "It is taught further, that we cannot obtain righteousness and the forgiveness of sins before God by our own merits, works, and atonement; but that we obtain the remission of sins, and are justified before God, by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, if we believe that Christ suffered for us, and that for his sake our sins are remitted unto us, and righteousness and eternal life are bestowed on us. For God regards this faith and imputes it as righteousness in his sight, as Paul says, Rom. chap. 3 and 4."

The title borne by the article is "Justification." But what is

Justification in the sense of those who wrote and expounded the article? A definition gathered from the total impression of their writings would read thus: Justification is that act of God by which out of mercy and grace he presents to the penitent sinner who trusts to the promises of the Gospel, the benefits of the obedience and righteousness of Christ, that is, pardons his sins and reckons him righteous. In analyzing the article we find at least three subjects for examination:

I. *The Nature of Justification.*

II. *The Ground of Justification.*

III. *The Instrument of Justification.*

I. *The Nature of Justification.* Justification in the evangelical sense means,

1. Pardon of sin or the non-imputation of the guilt of sin. *Pro forma* it is a declarative act by which God as judge pronounces a verdict of *not guilty*. It is a purely forensic act, and as such it is something done outside of the sinner and for him, and not within him. In this its purely objective character it stands opposed to the Romish conception, according to which justification means *to make righteous* by the infusion of righteousness, thus in part at least an ethical act, in part a physical act. In the evangelical conception Justification is also a single act: God at once and finally acquits the penitent believing sinner of the guilt of his sins.

In the Romish conception Justification is divided into two acts: The first is the ingrafting of love into the heart of the sinner, by which it becomes meet that God should reward him with the first Justification. *Meritum de congruo*. Then the sinner by progress in good works renders it just that God should confer larger grace, that is, renders it condign that he should confer the grace of everlasting life. *Meritum de condigno*. This is the second justification. Opposed to this stands the teaching of our article that man the sinner is not justified by his own merit or works, but alone by grace through faith in Christ.

2. The second thought in the nature of Justification is the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Justification, regarded simply as the act of pardon, is *negative*, and corres-

ponds to the passive obedience of Christ. This is inadequate, and leaves the sinner destitute of righteousness. But God who is a just judge, is also a merciful and bountiful heavenly Father. He delights in fulness, not in emptiness. When he pardons sin, he also imputes righteousness—"the righteousness of God." This is the positive feature of justification, and corresponds to the active obedience. It is the feature that makes man an heir of everlasting life. In the article it is said that "we obtain righteousness before God." We are regarded not only as having not transgressed, but as having fulfilled all righteousness. The act is one, and the two parts differ not *secundum rem*, but *secundum rationem*. Gerhard says: "The forgiveness of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, are not so much the two parts of justification, as one and the same thing, only with negative and positive expression. Justification before God can be stated positively as imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Better: Justification consists in the forgiveness of sin on the ground of the imputation of righteousness of Jesus Christ."

## II. *The Ground of Justification.*

1. *Negatively.* The ground of our justification is not "our own merit, works and satisfaction." These are not perfect. They do not meet the requirements of the divine law. They cannot make reparation for transgression. They do not confer righteousness. In opposition to the Romish doctrine of obedience and work-righteousness, the Apology says: "The doctrine that we must merit remission of sins by our works, is certainly a fiction and an error. It is likewise false and untrue that a man can become righteous and pious before God by his own works and external piety. It is unfounded and false that human reason is able of itself to love God above all things, to keep his commandments, to fear him, to be assured that he hears our prayers, to thank and obey him in afflictions and in other things enjoined by his law, such as not to covet the goods of others. All this human reason is not able to accomplish, although it can in some degree produce an honorable life externally and perform good works."

The point of the Lutheran teaching is (*a*) that present good works cannot atone for past disobedience, (*b*) that no works are pleasing to God which are done without the Holy Spirit, and prior to regeneration which is wrought through justification, (*c*) that even after justification and regeneration, works are not the ground of our righteousness before God. In a word the Lutheran doctrine makes a total exclusion *totaliter* of works from its conception of justification.

2. *Positively.* The ground of our justification is Christ who "suffered for our sins." "For his sake our sins are remitted unto us and righteousness and eternal life are bestowed on us." He is the meritorious cause of our justification. He was made subject to the law for our sake, his obedience, suffering and death were for us. This is called the righteousness of Christ, that is, the righteousness furnished by Christ; the righteousness of God, that is, the righteousness which avails before God; the righteousness of the Gospel; that is, which is revealed in the Gospel; the righteousness of faith, that is, which is appropriated by faith and is imputed to those who believe. In the earlier Lutheran theology much stress was laid (especially by Melancthon) on the sufferings and death of Christ. Later, stress was laid on his active obedience. By the former Christ is conceived to have atoned for sin and to have borne its penalty. By the latter he fulfilled the law. By the former we acquire forgiveness of sin. By the latter we have the imputation of righteousness. This makes the whole redemptory merit of Christ centre chiefly in his work. But his work dare not be separated from his person. It is the person who gives value to the work. It is the person who is specially well-pleasing to God. It is the person of Christ who is infinitely meritorious. His work we cannot comprehend. His person we can apprehend. It is the peculiar merit of modern theology that it brings into prominence the person of Christ. We may make affirmations about the obedience, and contemplate it under the two heads, and we may speculate on the relation of this obedience to the divine law and the divine nature, in theories of atonement, but nothing so satisfies and charms the

soul craving reconciliation as the person who is the subject of this obedience. We want the Christ of the Gospels, for he appears infinitely larger than the obedience which he renders. His personal mediation, his giving himself for us, makes him the supreme object of attraction and confidence. But the atoning work and the personal mediation can never be separated. Both ideas are brought out in the Apology: "Remission of sin and Righteousness are promised through Christ, who was given for us to atone for the sin of the world, and is the only Mediator and Redeemer. Therefore it is not through our merit that we are reconciled to God; for if it depended upon our merit, and if reconciliation to God and remission of sins came of the law, then were all lost; and slightly indeed should we be united and reconciled to God. For we do not keep the law, nor have we power to keep it."

### III. *The Instrument of Justification.*

The objective righteousness of Christ, the *causa meritoria* of justification, must be appropriated, that is, made ours. According to the article the instrument by which this is done is faith,— "Through faith, if we believe that Christ suffered for us." Faith thus is the instrument, or the instrumental cause of justification. We are justified if we believe that Christ died for us.

In the Lutheran theology it is said that we are justified by faith, through faith, out of faith, which faith is a living heart-confidence in the promises of God. *Fides est fiducia* is the Lutheran conception of faith. It consists of assent (which is an act of the intellect) and of consent (which is an act of the will) to the promise that God accepts the work as our own, and accounts us righteous because we are united with his person. But the chief element, the heart of faith is consent, as such it surrenders the person of the believer and accepts the person of Christ.

Strictly speaking it cannot be said that faith justifies, and nowhere in the Scripture is it said that faith justifies, but that we are justified by faith (*πίστει*, the instrumental dative). Faith moves God to justify us on account of Christ. The active quality in faith is that it accepts the forgiveness and righteousness

exhibited in the Gospel. Faith is simply the receiving organ of the soul. Says the Apology: "The divine promises offer to us, who are overcome by sin and death, help, grace and reconciliation for Christ's sake, which no man can attain through works, but alone through faith in Christ. This faith offers or presents to the Lord God no works, no merit of our own, but builds upon pure grace alone, and knows of no other consolation or trust than the mercy promised in Christ. Now this faith alone, when each one believes individually that Christ is given for him, obtains remission of sins for Christ's sake, and justifies us in the sight of God."

Emphasis is laid on individual or personal faith. Each person must accept Christ for himself—must be convinced that Christ is *his* Saviour, and must surrender himself to Christ. This is the appropriation of salvation. It is an act of the will guided and brought to a decision by the Holy Ghost without whom no man can call Christ Lord and Master; but it is not a meritorious act. It is an act of surrender, of trust, of appropriation.

Here now comes into view the deepest, the fundamental difference between Romanism and Lutheranism, "as in this article stands everything which we teach and live against the Pope, the Devil and the world." The two systems agree as touching the objective value and sufficiency of the work of Christ, and the merit of his person. To the question: How does the merit of Christ become ours? Romanism does not give the answer: By faith alone as a living trust of the heart of each individual, but by faith as the knowledge of the fact as true and real. It is sufficient for the individual to believe what the Church teaches. *Fides implicita*. According to Lutheranism faith justifies because it appropriates Christ immediately, and does not wait for an inner habitus, or love, or an inner desire for righteousness. It justifies before God in so far as the righteousness of Christ is imputed to it, which hides the sin and takes away its debt; not in so far as the righteousness of Christ is infused into the subject and is stamped upon it as its own subjective holiness and righteousness. "Faith justifies without asking whether sin has



been rooted out of the heart and destroyed or not, but because it is covered, forgiven, not reckoned, not regarded from the side of God." Philippi, *Symbolik*, p. 338.

Faith's chief office is to set the merit of Christ before God, or so to clothe the penitent sinner in the righteousness of Christ that he may stand unimpeached at the bar of God. This substituting or appropriating office belongs to faith *alone*. It alone can take the promise contained in the Gospel and set it before God. From the very nature, character and constitution of the soul we are shut up into faith, for faith and promise stand as the subjective and objective correlates of each other. It is not possible to appoint a substitute for faith, neither knowledge, nor feeling nor doing—only faith can lay hold of a promise, and can surrender the heart to the truth, and can give up body, soul and spirit to God the gracious and merciful Father. Hence emphasis is placed on the *particulæ exclusivæ*, "alone," "not of works," "the gift of God," "by grace," which are employed in order to exclude confidence in our works, and in any supposed excellence in human nature which might be regarded as even a prerequisite to justification. The article closes by saying that "God regards this faith, and imputes it as righteousness in his sight." He regards it not for what it is in itself, but for what it contains. It is the ring which encloses the diamond. It is the diamond which God regards, not the ring *per se*.

Now if it be conceded that the chief object of the Divine revelation contained in Holy Scripture, is the salvation of man, then it follows that what holy Scripture teaches in regard to the salvation of man must be regarded as its central thought. Lutheranism finds the central thought of scriptural teaching in justification by faith. Then it follows that if the Lutheran system is to be a biblical system, justification must be made the centre of the system, or the central doctrine,—not in the sense that the other doctrines of Christianity are or are to be developed out of this central doctrine, but in the sense that they must be so stated as to harmonize with this central doctrine. It must be to the system what the centre of a circle is to the circle, viz., the point for observation and determination. It is in this sense that the



Lutheran Church regards justification by faith as the article of a standing or falling Church, by which it means that when this doctrine is held in purity the other doctrines cannot be held in fatal error. It also means more, viz., that there is a series of allied doctrines, some going before, as the doctrine of man, of God, of the Trinity, of the Person and Work of Christ, and some following after, as the doctrine of Regeneration, of Sanctification, of the Means of Grace, of Good Works, of the Church. All these are shaped both in their formal statement and in their practical use by the central doctrine. No sooner do we write the word "Justification" than we inquire: "Justification from what?" The answer leads directly to the doctrine of sin, which both logic and faith require to be stated in harmony with the central doctrine. And just as directly does the doctrine of sin lead to inquiry into the original condition of man. Here we reach the *terminus a quo*. We can go no further back. What was the original condition of man, from which he departed, which departure brought sin, from which he must be justified before God alone by faith in Christ? Lutheranism harmonizes her answer with her doctrine of justification: Man originally by natural endowment was righteous and acceptable to God. As bearing the divine image he could please God in knowledge, love and service. This conception is expressed in the Apology: "This the Holy Scriptures also testify when they say that man was created after God's own image and likeness, Gen. 1 : 27. For what else is this, but that the divine wisdom and righteousness, which are of God, were formed in man, through which we know God, through which the brightness of God was reflected in us; that is, that these gifts, namely, a true, clear knowledge of God, true fear of and confidence in him, etc., were given to man when he was first created?" Had man remained in this condition of concreated holiness justification would not have been needed. It is needed now only to restore man to his original condition. What that condition was can be understood from what justification proposes, for it cannot do more, and it dare not do less than restore the image and likeness of God in man: "And put on the new man which after God hath been

created in righteousness and holiness of truth," Eph. 4 : 24 ; Col. 3 : 14. Thus the righteousness of faith must restore or be a substitute for original righteousness. Hence the doctrine of the latter must be shaped in harmony with the doctrine of the former, which as embracing the central content of all that the Scriptures teach in regard to redemption, must determine the view to be taken of what they teach of man in his original condition, who is now become the subject of justification.

None the less true is it that justification furnishes the proper view-point for defining original sin. What is original sin? If justification be the pardon of sin and the gift of righteousness, then original sin must be the loss of original righteousness, for God who justifies would not confer upon man what he already possesses, that is, the power to know, to love and to serve. Original righteousness and original sin must be the ethico-religious antitheses of each other. Original sin removes original righteousness. Original sin is the want of original righteousness. But as original righteousness was not an idle inefficient quality, but a natural endowment which filled the soul with holy affections, so original sin is not a mere defect, or negation. It is also a positive affection of the moral powers of man which exercises itself in unholy affections and immoral deeds,—actual sins. See *Augs. Conf.*, II. *Apol.* II. *Form of Conc.* I.

Thus radically affected by sin, and radically inclined to evil, man cannot be restored by some outside assistance, or by incentives to do good. He needs thorough, radical, internal restoration. He needs the removal of the blindness of mind, and of the alienation of heart in reference to God, and the overcoming of the "evil concupiscence." He needs new powers of will, new affections of the heart, before he can again occupy the right relation to God, which, as God is Spirit, must be a spiritual relation. The new powers and affections he cannot create, for he cannot remove the inborn darkness of his mind, nor expel the enmity to God which dwells in the heart. Help must come from without. The nature of the help will be determined by the nature of the need. Romanism which defines original righteousness as a superadded gift, and as a "prevarication," that

is, does not allow that sin is a deep radical corruption of all the intellectual, moral and spiritual powers of man, teaches that man needs external support and steadying rather than internal cleansing and healing. It is satisfied with self-justification by works. But Lutheranism, because of its deeper view of sin, takes a different view of justification. Man cannot prepare himself for justification, neither can he merit the forgiveness of sins. He is by nature condemned and subject to wrath. He is under the curse of a broken law. The preaching of the law can only lead him to a knowledge of sin, and to the consciousness of the guilt of sin, to a sense of his own impotence, and of his need of a representative to atone for his disobedience, to avert the anger of God and to remove the curse.

With this view of sin Lutheranism finds in Christ, in his person and work, a holy harmless Mediator between God and man, who on the one hand is the embodiment of the divine righteousness and love, and on the other hand is the vicarious sacrifice for sins; who by his own sufferings and death pays the penalty of transgression and enables the Father to look upon the sinner who hides himself behind Christ, as just and holy and free from guilt. Thus Lutheranism places the ground of justification entirely outside of man.

This is all included in the third article, in which it is said that Christ truly suffered, was crucified, died and was truly buried that he might be a sacrifice not only for original sins, but also for all other sins, and might appease the wrath of God, or as it is expressed in the Apology: "Christ suffered and died for us to reconcile us to God." In order now that this double reconciliation may go into effect, it is required only that the vicarious merit should be made ours. How this is done—and that is the principal thing in the application of redemption—is stated in the fourth article. But justification is not merely the forgiveness of individual sins. Much rather is it a *principian* forgiveness, a forgiveness that sets in a new relation with God, that makes a righteous man out of an unrighteous one, and gives adoption with the Father. It is a forgiveness which brings Christ who is the life into the heart. Hence not only is a new

external relation established; a new internal condition is created. The faith which brought Christ was preceded by a renunciation of sin and by the moral resolve to follow holiness. A new mind has been formed within. With faith, which is the gift of God, is also given the Holy Ghost who renews and sanctifies. The whole divine Trinity is active. The Son who reconciles and the Spirit who regenerates are not one and the same person with the Father. And yet he who reconciles to God must be God, and he who so regenerates a human soul that it stands in a spiritual relation to God must be God.

Thus the Lutheran central principle presupposes the doctrine of the Trinity, as it does also the doctrine of sin as a deep radical corruption of nature, and the doctrine of a Divine Substitute for sin. But for the very reason that justification is a principian forgiveness, it is also attended by certain results, the most immediate of which is Regeneration. Melancthon confounded the two. But the Form of Concord distinguishes them and puts justification first. As a real and true trust of the heart faith is an active energy which works the love of God, and can no more be separated from a virtuous life, and from good works, than heat and light can be separated from fire. Hence as Philippi says: "Sanctification and renewal of the heart are the immediate result of justification, the love which necessarily goes out in good works, the fruit inseparably joined to faith, as a sign that faith is true and living." Such fruit must result from the very nature of faith, which with Christ enters into fellowship with God, receives the gift of the Holy Ghost and a new heart, and is gifted with love to God and to man. Says Philippi again: "All this takes place not in separate and successive moments of time, but *uno ictu temporis*. Faith and justification are verily cause and reason of love and sanctification, the latter the effect and result of the former, taking place not in chronological succession, but in a succession of the reality. Were it otherwise, if love were subsequently added to faith, then faith not in and of itself would be the living power of love, but it would first be made alive through the superadded love, and would be swept back again from the idea of the Protestant *fides viva* to the Catholic *fides formata*." (*Symbolik*, p. 342).

But if faith gives fellowship with God and a new heart, two things must result corresponding to the two gifts:

(a) Where there is fellowship with God, there must be peace of conscience, and pleasure in the service of God. As the believer's righteousness is the righteousness of Christ, which is perfect, and which in no sense is the result of his own merit or works, it must satisfy all sense of guilt, and quiet all accusations of conscience. This has been classically expressed by Melancthon in *The Apology*: "Faith alone pacifies the heart, which obtains rest and life when it freely and confidently relies upon the promises of God, for Christ's sake. But our works can never pacify the heart, for we continually find that they are impure; consequently it must follow that through faith alone we become acceptable to God and righteous, when we are satisfied in our heart that God will be merciful to us, not on account of our works, and our fulfilment of the law, but by grace alone for Christ's sake."

(b) As faith gives the Holy Ghost and regenerates the heart, the believer must do good works acceptable to God. The new energy of love and the spirit of obedience within will not only strive against sin, they bring forth fruit in righteousness. They will keep the law of God; they will delight in serving their neighbor. Hence justification actualizes Luther's paradox: "A Christian is the most free lord of all and subject of none; a Christian is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to everyone." The doctrine is stated in Article Sixth: "Faith must bring forth good fruits and good works, and we must do all manner of good works because of God's requirement and command." Further: Justification gives the only sure foundation for righteousness of conduct, for it establishes the new life-principle of love. He who knows by experience that salvation has come to him from the mercy and love of God, is constrained by an inner spiritual, but most free necessity to love God in return. And since it is of the very nature of love to manifest itself, it

will obey the will of its object.\* "The love of Christ constraineth us." 2 Cor. 5 : 14.

An important question arises: How does faith originate? If it be the gift of God, is it his gift with or without means? Commonly we say that Christ is the object of faith. Strictly and primarily not so. The direct and immediate object of faith is the promise contained in the divine word. Christ is the object of faith only in so far as he is the content, the Alpha and Omega of the word. Faith is confidence in the promise of the Gospel which witnesses of the grace of God and of the benefit of Christ. The word calls, enlightens, convicts of sin, creates a sense of the need of salvation and finally trust in the grace exhibited in the Gospel. External circumstances may contribute to the result, but at bottom it was the word preached and heard that produces faith. The internal is not given except through the external. The Holy Ghost is active in and through the word. Hence the word is the power of God unto salvation. The power may be resisted, but when it is met by the moral determination of the

---

\*But it must be conceded that the Lutheran central principle has not always been held in close association with the highest ethical conduct. Lutherans have been accused of uncharitableness and severity towards opponents, and the Lutheran Church has been accused of a lack of discipline in relation to the conduct of its members. The measure of truth that resides in the accusation can be accounted for on the ground of the misapplication of the principle. Too often has justification been held as a cover not only for past sins, but for future ones. Too often has the dogma been substituted for the experience. Too often has it been magnified at the expense of the keeping of the law of God. Too often has the doctrine had the assent of the understanding and not the consent of the heart. Too often has the shibboleth: "The doctrine of a standing or falling church," excluded the thought of the necessity of regeneration; and too often has the doctrine of justification by faith been supplanted by the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration—always to the lowering of the standard of morality.

But treated according to its true conception, as an experience of salvation, and as attended by regeneration, it founds ethics in the new man, who strives to overcome the old man, and it actualizes its own corollary that the believer must do works acceptable to God. Held as an experience of salvation, it brings into such close fellowship with the whole Divine Trinity as to create and foster the fear of God, and a proper regard for those who are God's. Thus on the one hand we have piety and on the other, charity, as the fruit of justification by faith.

hearer, faith is the result. Faith is the gift of God through means working on the free moral and spiritual nature of man. It is in this way that God honors the freedom of man and makes him responsible for the final determination of his destiny. "God hath begotten us again according to his will by the word of his truth." James 1 : 18. If to this Scripture we join our experience, we will find a beautiful expression of both in Article Fifth of our Confession: "To attain this faith God has instituted the office of the ministry," etc.

(a) The word is unquestionably the primary, the most comprehensive, the chief means for the production of faith. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," or as Luther with a true, almost instinctive conception of Paul's meaning, put it: "Faith cometh by preaching, and preaching out of the word of God." Where the word is preached, there a real, objective, Christ-bearing, Spirit-witnessing truth is operative. When this truth comes in the form of law, its mission is the production of a knowledge of sin and contrition, the antecedents and presuppositions of faith. When it comes in the form of Gospel its mission is the promotion of confidence in the mercy of God. This is faith proper. "For the preaching of God's word and the hearing of it are the instruments of the Holy Ghost, by, with and through which he wishes to operate efficaciously, and to convert men to God, and to work in them both to will and to do." *Form of Concord.*

(b) In the richness and fulness of his provision for the increase of faith, God has added the sacraments. They are signs attached to the promise, but they do not add to the promise, which is complete in itself and contains the offer of all grace. The sacraments, sign, seal and specialize the grace. "They are external signs or ceremonies which God has enjoined, and with which he has connected the promise of grace." Luther represents the sacrament as a visible word, for the external sign is like a picture, and signifies the same thing that is preached by the word; both, therefore, effect the same thing. "When we hear the Gospel or meditate upon it or receive the sacraments and are comforted by faith, then is the Holy Spirit active."



Apology. As between the two means of grace a difference exists chiefly in this: While the word works faith, the sacraments are more especially designed to seal and confirm faith. Such is the experience of the Christian. Hence not the sacrament, but faith in the sacrament justifies. The *Opus Operatum* of Rome is rejected. But the efficacy of the means *in usu utentis* is affirmed. Wherever the Gospel is preached and the sacraments are administered, there the means are at hand for the production of faith. The Holy Ghost is with the means. Where and when he will he works faith in those who hear the Gospel. The time and place are according to God's good pleasure, but the promise is sure.

But since the Holy Ghost dwells in the word and operates through the word, a dignity is imparted to the word which cannot be claimed for the traditions or institutions of men. The word alone must make articles of faith, and must be the *norma dicendi*. This is the formal principle of Christianity, which exists in connection with that freedom of the Christian man which in matters of faith delivers him from bondage to all rites, ceremonies, and institutions of men. What is not enjoined by the word of God is not to be laid on the Christian's conscience, or to be imposed as a test of unity of faith. A clear and sharp distinction must be made between the *Heilsordnung* and the *Kirchenordnung*. The observance of the former is obligatory. The use of the latter is optional. *Art. 15.*

But our principle has yet another consequence of great importance. It alone enables us to reach a proper definition of the Church. We have already said that Romanism is dominated by the Church-principle, or by the principle that the Church is the mediatrix of salvation, and is chiefly an external organization. Faith in the Church and obedience to the same are the first conditions of salvation. He who would be united with Christ, the Head, must be united with his visible body, the Church. Thus the person and work of Christ are thrown into the background and shadowed by the Church. Exactly the reverse of this takes place when we accept Justification as the central principle. This principle exalts Christ and makes him



sole Mediator between God and man. This principle makes fellowship with the Father dependent solely upon faith in Christ, and it alone gives the experience of salvation through the witness of the Spirit. Manifestly then the Church as the body of Christ can have as its members only those who are united with the Head, for the Head is first. But according to our principle union with the Head occurs only through faith. True, the Church has administered the means of grace, which have wrought faith, but she has acted only as the servant of her Lord, not as his vicegerent. She has wrought to make men members of Christ, not members of a visible organization. She has presented Christ and faith in him as the only absolutely essential things, and with this she has proclaimed the necessity of regeneration. Indeed she recognizes only those as members of Christ who are born from above.

Starting now with these premises, it is easy to reach a definition of the Church. Stress, the stress that characterizes, must not be laid on an external relation, but on an internal condition. Faith and the new life must stand in the foreground. Believers only are righteous; they only are regenerated. Then only these constitute the body of Christ. Thus faith and regeneration are differentiating. Believers and regenerate persons constitute a distinct class. It is in harmony with this idea that the Church is defined as a "Congregation of Saints" or "*Versammlung der Heiligen*." These alone constitute the Church in its essence. Only saints and believers have fellowship with Christ and in him fellowship with each other. This fellowship, though invisible and spiritual, manifests itself in outward organization, and by the use of means. It is internal and spiritual in its essence, but external and empirical in form. Its true external criteria are the word and the sacraments. Where these are rightly employed, there are saints and believers, and there is the Church. Hypocrites may stand in the empirical form, but they do not compose any part of the essence, neither do they enjoy the "Communion of Saints." They are in the Church, but they are not of the Church. The Church is a spiritual society whose members are kings and priests into God. By virtue of their

kingship they prevail over all things. By virtue of their priesthood they have access to God. The ecclesiastical priesthood which arrogates to itself the right to mediate between God and man, has no place in a system dominated by our central principle. Faith which brings Christ into the heart gives immediate assurance of adoption into the family of God.

Thus we discern the wide-reaching consequence of the Lutheran central principle. It determines how every doctrine of Christianity must be held. It also determines the relative value of doctrines. In proportion as a doctrine assists in the production of a living faith, is it to be estimated. If it cannot be shown that a doctrine directly promotes faith, and that which invariably attends faith, then it cannot be insisted that that doctrine shall be made a final test of soundness in the faith. He who holds correctly the material principle, holds it not simply as a dogma, but as a fact of experience, undoubtedly has *more*, and may have impliedly vastly more, than many a one who grasps all the natural and logical consequences of the principle. He who has the principle as a fact of experience, has fellowship with Christ and with all saints. Hence he is to be recognized as a Christian, and within limits determined by propriety and mutual benefit, he is accorded access to the blessings which we find in the Church. If we believe there is a "holy catholic Church" none the less must we believe that there is a "Communion of Saints" in that Church.\*

---

\*The reader will find a tolerably full discussion of "THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS" in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for January, 1894. The subject is also treated in a NOTE in "Elements of Religion," by Dr. H. E. Jacobs, pp. 288 et seq.

This NOTE is remarkable chiefly for three things:

1. Its exhibition of obsolete learning.
2. Its almost complete ignoring of the historical meaning of *communio sanctorum*, and,
3. Its utter silence in regard to the judgments, opinions and conclusions of modern Protestant scholars. Indeed the NOTE does not contain the opinion of a single Lutheran scholar since Gerhard (†1637); and only one (German) Reformed scholar (Heppe) is quoted, without date or page, but presumably from a work written prior to the investigations of Caspari, Von Zezschwitz, Schaff, Harnack, Zahn, Kattenbusch, Blume, Gasquet *et*

*al.*; not one of whom is quoted in the NOTE, but all of whom give facts and opinions in diametrical opposition to the proposition which the NOTE seeks to establish. In other words, not one of these original investigators supports the view "that 'communion of saints' is in apposition to 'Church,'" if the matter be considered historically. At this point we give the opinions *inter alios* of three most competent scholars:

*Kattenbusch*: "That regarded in its original sense, or 'historically' it should not be so understood (as *Gemeinde der Heiligen*) is to me not doubtful." *Apostolicum*, (1892), p. 31.

*Zahn*: "We see that he (Nicetas) understands *Sanctorum* of persons, and that too, as the connection shows, of saints or believers of all ages. Also with him is *communio* an abstract term, or relation of the individual to these saints. thus a communion with them." *Apostles' Creed*, (1892), p. 88.

*Von Zenschwitz*: After declaring that all down through the Middle Ages the reference is to *saints* in heaven, he says: "Considered historically it will have to be said that the explanation with reference to the congregation of saints in heaven, as even in Augustine the idea appears, has the preponderance." *Katechetik*, 2, p. 121.

The NOTE is oblivious of all this, and coolly implies that the reverse is the fact, when it says: "The transition among Protestants whereby 'the communion of saints' is regarded by some as a separate article, can be traced," p. 296.

The fact is, the "transition" was made in the opposite direction, that is, towards considering " 'communion of saints' in apposition to 'Church.'" A few learned opinions here may be in place:

*Köhler*: "The identification of 'communion of saints' in the third article of the Creed with the Church, is not based on its original meaning. It (the identification) goes back to Luther, who as the Larger Catechism," etc. *Kirchenrecht* (1894), p. 4.

*Schaff*: "This identification may be questioned. The holy catholic church corresponds rather to the church visible, the communion of saints to the church invisible. The communion of saints means that inward and spiritual fellowship of true believers on earth and in heaven which is based on their union with Christ. It is their fellowship with God the Father, the Son, and the Spirit (comp. 1 John 1:3; 1 Cor. 1:9; Phil. 2:1), and with each other, a fellowship not broken by death, but extending to saints above. A most precious idea.

"The article of the *communio sanctorum* (as well as the epithet *catholica*) is a late insertion, and not found in the creeds before the fifth century. See Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I., 22 and II., 52. The oldest commentators understood it of saints in heaven. According to the Catechism of Trent, it means 'a community of spiritual blessings' especially the sacraments enjoyed in the Catholic Church." *Hist. Ch. Church*, VI., (1888), p. 527-8.

*Oehler*: "The most probable view is that according to the original sense of the article, by saints is understood the *congregation above*, or that by the communion of the Church on earth is certified that of the congregation of the perfected. Undoubtedly Faustus of Rigi in his second homily on the Creed presupposes this interpretation. Even in the sermons on the Creed attached to the Works of Augustine, but usually ascribed to Cæsar of Arles, the reference is made distinctly to the heavenly congregation of the saints 'who died in the faith which we have received.'" *Symbolik*, p. 56.

Let these opinions of great scholars stand against the NOTE, and its theory of "apposition."

We turn now to the early users of the article "*communio sanctorum*."

Nicetas (about 400-420): Post confessionem beatae Trinitatis jam profiteri credere *sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam*. Ecclesia quid aliud, quam sanctorum omnium congregatio? Ab exordio enim sæculi sive patriarchæ, sive Apostoli, sive martyres, sive *ceteri justi qui fuerunt, qui sunt, qui erunt una Ecclesia sunt*: quia una fide et conversatione sanctificati; uno spiritu signati, unum corpus effecti sunt; cujus corporis caput Christus, sicut perhibetur et scriptum est (Coloss. 1: 18). Adhuc amplius dico. Etiam angeli, etiam virtutes et potestates supernæ in hac una confoederantur Ecclesia; Apostolo nos docente, quia in Christo reconciliata sunt omnia, non solum quæ in terra sunt verum et quæ in coelo. (Coloss. 1: 20). *Ergo* in hac una Ecclesia crede te *communione* consecuturum esse *sanctorum*. Scito unam hanc esse Ecclesiam *catholicam* in omni orbe terræ constitutam, cujus *communione* debes firmiter retinere."

1. This passage from Nicetas is absolutely ignored by the NOTE, except the sentence: "What else is the Church but the congregation of all saints," which is quoted at second hand. In this sentence Nicetas gives a definition of the "Church," but he calls it "the congregation of all saints," a definition almost literally identical with that given in the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession, and which would be almost universally accepted by Protestant Christendom.

2. The merest tyro in Latin will see (a) that *communio* is used by Nicetas in the abstract sense of *communion*, (b) that "the communion of saints" is found "in this one Church," (c) that it is the duty of the Christian "to firmly maintain this communion with the one Catholic Church established in the whole world." In other words, according to Nicetas the one "catholic church" and "the communion of saints" are not in apposition, but are two separate and distinct clauses.

*Faustus of Rigi*: "We now pass to the communion of saints: This clause confounds those who blasphemously affirm that the ashes of the saints and friends of God are not to be held in honor."

All scholars agree that *communio sanctorum* was in the Creed of Faustus (about 450 or 460), and that as Zückler says, "he explains it in isolation from the preceding holy catholic church." That is, he treats it as an

independent clause. In another place Faustus says: "We also believe the communion of saints."

The NOTE *absolutely* ignores Faustus, and says: "The clause 'communion of saints' was one of the final links in the gradual development of the Apostles' Creed. It cannot be traced earlier than A. D. 550." Scholars find it at least 150 years earlier than that, and are certain that it was in the Creed 100 years earlier than the date assigned by the NOTE.

*Gasquet*, a learned Catholic writer: "*Sanctorum Communionem* is not found in any of the early creeds. As far as I can trace it is first seen in the sermon ascribed to St. Cæsaris, after that in Faustus of Riez, and in the Mozarabic and Gallo-Irish liturgies. There can be no doubt that Pearson was right in pointing out the stress that was laid by early writers upon the unity between the church militant and the church triumphant, as one of the principal reasons for the insertion of this article; besides the passages he quotes, the language of the sixth council of Toledo, *omnis ecclesia collocata jam in regno caelesti et degens in saeculo praesenti* is worth remarking for its clearness. We may conclude from a sermon of Faustus of Reiz that this article was employed, if not introduced into the Creed to condemn the heresy of Vigilantius, who had recently opposed the cultus of the saints, on the ground that they were not yet united to Christ in heaven." He then quotes the words of Faustus as given above. *Dublin Review*, 1889.

*Harnack*: "In the first place we cannot understand how a mere exegetical appositive should come into the Creed, and that too in Gaul, and secondly the explanation of the words in Faustus leads in another direction." *Dogmengeschichte*, III. p. 218.

It is indeed worthy of inquiry why an exegetical appositive should be inserted in the Creed. It would be without a parallel. It has never been claimed that any other article of the Creed bears any such relation. The NOTE does not assign a reason why this appositive should have been added at this time, and that too in South Gaul. The NOTE is dumb at the very point where we most desire to hear it speak. What historical reason can be given for the insertion of *Communio Sanctorum* as an *appositive*? We await an answer based on facts.

*Nitzsch*: "The *Sanctorum Communionem* in the Apostles' Creed is regarded by the Reformers as (ep-exegetical) *appositive* to *sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*, but this is not historically correct. \* \* Aside from uncertain references, the words meet us first in Faustus of Reji, and at the same time there meets us an explanation of them which excludes that of the Reformers. Faustus understands by 'saints' the perfected saints and martyrs in heaven." *Dogmatik* (1891), p. 529.

*Köstlin*: "Manifestly *Sanctorum* is to be understood as masculine, and not as neuter, as the Greek theologians are wont to speak of *κοινωνία*

τῶν ἀγίων. One has no right to take communio as Gemeinde instead of in the usual abstract sense of Gemeinschaft." *Herzog*, V. 58.

*Dr. Walsch, Bishop of Ossory*: "In the earlier creeds of the Eastern Church it was thought sufficient to set forth the nature of the Church as a great corporate body, but it was afterwards felt, especially in the Western Church, that something was needed to express more definitely the bond of union which unites all the children of God, and thus call attention to the duties and privileges which that union implies, and so the clause was added—'the communion of saints.'" *The Church and Her Doctrines* (1892) p. 158. It was added not as an *appositive*, but to express the bond of union which unites all the children of God. This is sufficient reason for its insertion. It was brought in to express a new thought, not simply to explain an old one.

*Bouvier*: "Sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem; non dicimus, 'Credo in Ecclesiam,' sed 'Credo Ecclesiam, scilicet eam esse. \* \* Per sanctorum communionem, intelligitur quaedam esse societatem et bonorum spiritualium participationem inter eos qui sunt in Ecclesia." It is most astonishing that the NOTE should quote this passage from a Catholic theologian in support of its theory of "apposition," whereas the learned author means just the reverse. Wisely does the NOTE refrain from translation. A learned friend stands sponsor for the following literal rendering: "Holy catholic church, the communion of saints; we do not say, 'I believe in the Church,' but I believe the Church, namely, that it is. \* \* By the communion of saints is meant that there is a certain fellowship and participation of spiritual blessings between those who are in the Church," Bouvier, like Nicetas, distinguishes between "Church" and "the Communion of Saints." The latter is a blessing enjoyed by those who are in the Church. And no argument against this interpretation can be drawn from the fact that Bouvier separates Sanctam ecclesiam catholicam from sanctorum communionem by a comma. In a large number of copies of the Creed just examined, the majority of which were printed from 200 to 350 years ago, and in three different languages, the punctuation of the clauses of the third article, in every case but one, is coördinate. Sometimes the clauses are separated by commas, sometimes by colons, sometimes by periods. In the one exceptional case the deviation is not between "Church" and "the communion of saints." In a facsimile of the Utrecht Psalter, perhaps of the sixth century, the punctuation of the third article is as follows:

CREDO ET IN SP̄M SC̄M SCAM,  
ECCLESIAM CATHOLICAM,  
SCORUM COMMUNIO  
NEM REMISSIONEM,  
PECCATORUM CARNIS RESURRECTIONEM VITAM AETERNAM AMEN

Attention is called to the slightly oblique stroke that separates scorum (sanctorum) from communionem, and that the same punctuation separates

the Amen from what precedes. Other words that form a clause are separated by marks of punctuation. In ancient manuscripts and fac-similes which have been recently examined, not only clauses, but words in the same clause, and syllables in the same word, and even letters in the same syllable, are separated by the *dot*, which is the most frequently occurring mark of punctuation in ancient manuscripts and inscriptions. Indeed the punctuation of ancient manuscripts and inscriptions is almost wholly arbitrary, and, says an eminent authority, began to lose its significance in the fifth century. Hence he who would follow the punctuation of old manuscripts and inscriptions and seek to make it decisive in interpretation of ancient documents, and in the present punctuation of the same, reveals chiefly his ignorance of palaeography and his utter lack of linguistic tact. Common sense, the laws of language and historic usage must decide. The argument may be summed up as follows:

1. Originally *communio sanctorum* was used (by Nicetas, Faustus, Cæsar of Arles *et al.*) as a separate and distinct article, and not "in apposition to Church." Of this the evidence is so conclusive as to produce consensus among investigators.

2. All down through the Middle Ages such usage, and the abstract meaning of *communio* had the preponderance. This proposition cannot be refuted. It is supported by the NOTE's own authorities.

3. The Roman Catholic Church has never identified the article with the one which precedes. Until the contrary is shown we must conclude that she has kept the true tradition.

4. The "transition" to the identification, or "apposition" theory, can be traced to the sixteenth century, with only here and there a possible prior exception which helps to establish the rule of non-identification.

Now against these conclusions established by the investigations of the best recent and living scholars, stands the NOTE, which is far more remarkable for what it ignores and omits than for what it exhibits, except its exhibition of obsolete learning. We fear the NOTE has taken counsel of its dogmatic preconceptions rather than of history, or has sought to make history by ignoring history. "The most charitable judgment that can possibly be formed concerning this NOTE is that it was written before the author had thoroughly mastered the subject."

If the NOTE will persist in maintaining its dogmatic determination in the face of the most patent facts of history, we can only commit it to the error of its way, and apply the old adage: "Ab una nota discite omnes." But if *communio sanctorum* is to be held as the equivalent of *Gemeinde der Heiligen*, then let the NOTE have the courage of a Luther and translate it "congregation of saints." That would be consistent, and would probably earn as great a reputation for scholarship as is acquired by manufacturing and at the same time ignoring history. But the great bulk of Western Christians will still prefer to believe "the communion of saints." If we cannot accept the Catholic conception of "the communion of saints," as certainly Protestants can as little accept it as they can accept the Catholic



conception of "holy catholic church," let us at least retain the words with suitable (coördinate in all the clauses of the third article) punctuation in our creeds, together with the kernel of truth which undoubtedly is contained in the Catholic hull, and let us add to this kernel that fulness of conception which the divine word warrants, as one of the precious experiences of those who by a living faith are united to the one Lord Christ. The "holy catholic church" is an object of faith, full and complete in itself. It needs no expansion or exegesis in the Creed. In its essence the Church is invisible, dwells in the Spirit, and is composed of all those of all ages who are united to the one Head. In the holy Catholic Church, but only with its true members who are justified and sanctified, will we find a holy common participation in all the blessings and benefits of redemption. This is "the communion of saints," which has its highest expression in what the Greeks understood by *κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων*.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE SUPER-ANGELIC RANK OF THE REDEEMER.—Heb. i.\*

BY PROF. EDMUND J. WOLF, D. D.

1. God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, 2. hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds: 3. who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high; 4. having become by so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they. 5. For unto which of the angels said he at any time,

Thou art my Son,

This day have I begotten thee?

and again,

I will be to him a Father,

And he shall be to me a Son?

6. And when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. 7. And of the angels he saith,

Who maketh his angels winds,

And his ministers a flame of fire:

8. but of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: And the sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. 9. Thou has loved righteousness, and hated iniquity:

Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee

With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

---

\*Advance sheets of Vol. IX., of the Lutheran Commentary (in Press) by the Christian Literature Company, New York.



It is God who speaks. The methods and the media of his word were formerly varied, but he has now spoken as never before, having made the crowning revelation in his Son, for whom the world was destined and by whom it was fashioned, and who as the embodiment of God's glory and the expression of his essence, the upholder and the purifier of the universe, seated himself by the right hand of God, lifted above the angels as far as his singular name is exalted above theirs. The first sentence of the Epistle strikes its keynote announcing abruptly, but majestically, the ground theme of the whole treatise, to wit, that the revelation of God in his Son is as much more imperative and inviolable than the revelations in created organs, as his person is more exalted than theirs. Both its completeness and its certitude are guaranteed by a divine ambassador.

The opening is peculiar. The only New Testament letter which has a similar introduction is the First of John. Almost every word of the exordium offers a text which receives amplification and application in the body of the Epistle.

Vs. 1. *πολυμερῶς*, consisting of many parts, given piecemeal, additions being made as circumstances admitted. The fragmentary character of all former revelations casting upon them the stamp of imperfection, 10 : 1, 2, it is implied that the final revelation in the Son is complete once for all.

*Πολυτρόπως*, given in many ways, having a diversity of forms and modes. Not only were the contents of successive revelations fractional, but they varied also considerably in form. Truth was given in divers modes, *i. e.* in dreams, visions, from mouth to mouth, Num. 12 : 6, 8, through angels, symbols, types, &c. Moll: "The term points partly to the distinction of law and prophecy, doctrine and exhortation, threatening and promise, in the prophetic discourses ; partly to the diversity of personal individuality, the respective modes of teaching which distinguished a Moses, a David, an Isaiah."

The former term has no chronological import, and the contrast is not between God speaking often in the prophets and only once in the Son, but between revelations variously distributed among the prophets, and the undivided fulness and ab-

solute character of that given in the New Testament. The distinctive feature of prophecy was *ἐν μέρους*, "in part," 1 Cor. 13 : 9.

Tholuck regarded both adverbs as mere amplifications, but our author is not given to a parade of rhetoric, although the rich and full-sounding words of his rhythmic periods may easily dazzle the expositor. The assonant terms specify the peculiarities of the Old Covenant, and, without naming the contrasted characteristics of the New Covenant, they imply with skillful emphasis that the manifold and multiform fragments of truth have received their completion in Christ, that we now have revelation in its ultimate form, the Logos incarnate, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, in whom as in a spectrum all the varied rays and hues of truth meet and harmonize. Besides pointing to a now perfected revelation, these carefully chosen words bring to view also the painstaking solicitude shown by God to his ancient people.

Fond of contrasts and parallels, either expressed or suggested, the author opposes "of old time" to the phrase "at the last of these days," referring to revelation in former times, concluding with Malachi who closed the succession of prophets about four centuries B. C. *πάλαι* is equivalent to long ago. After the close of the Canon there was no revelation until he came, who with his messenger was foretold by the last Old Testament prophet.

Whatever the diversity in times, instruments and forms of ancient revelations, they were, even as this final one is, divine communications. God spake then as now. *λαλεῖν* in the sense of the revealing articulation of God occurs Eph. 2 : 2 ; Acts 3 : 24 ; Jas. 5 : 10 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 21. The prophets, like John, were each the voice of an Invisible One crying in the desert of error and sin. Those who heard them heard God. The essential connection between the two dispensations is maintained from the start. They have a common source and a common purpose. They form one temple of truth in which the former is the outer, the latter the inner, sanctuary or holy of holies.

"Unto the fathers," the forefathers, all the former generations

of Israel which preceded the ἡμῖν, who are now living. Sir. 44; Acts 3 : 22; Rom. 9 : 5. Obviously the author was a Jew, he and his readers alike familiar with Old Testament history. "In the prophets." The New Testament often speaks of "the prophets," referring to the Old Testament Scriptures, or a portion of them when they were classified as the law and the prophets, or the law, the prophets and the psalms. Luke 24 : 44. But the parallel ἐν ᾧ points to the prophets personally.

A prophet in the widest sense is God's mouthpiece, and this designation doubtless includes here all the vehicles of divine communication, all to whom and through whom God spoke under the Old Covenant, the organs of his word in contrast with him who sharing his nature was himself God's Word in person.

Moses held the first rank among the prophets. Deut. 33 : 10. Philo calls him the archprophet. Enoch, Jude 14, Noah, Abraham, Gen. 20 : 7, and the patriarchs generally are numbered among the prophets. Ps. 105 : 15.

Luther, Calvin and others take ἐν=διά, implying bare instrumentality. Such use of it here is pronounced a Hebraism—an unconscious Hebraism according to Ebrard, who recognizes the pure Greek of the Epistle. There is no justification for a deviation from the classic import of ἐν, the sphere in which something takes place. Some supply ᾧ obviating an immediate reference to λαλεῖν. It expresses more than διά, the idea of which it really includes, and it shows that God, while he spake through the prophets, was within them. He was in the prophets and spake to the fathers, he was in Christ and spake to us. Still as the mode of the indwelling was not the same, that with the prophets being indirect, by the Spirit and transient, that with the Son essential, hypostatic and abiding, and as the English idiom often requires a rendering somewhat different from the Greek, it is best to add the instrumental idea, especially as it enhances the contrast with the next clause. The dynamic indwelling of God in the prophets was such as to make them the tongue of God, who was the real speaker. The expression intimates "the certainty of revelation and the presence of God with his word."

"At the end of these days," or "in the closing period of these days," is the literal rendering of the accepted text. The phrase is generally regarded as a technical, indispensable Hebrew expression, "inasmuch as it relates to a doctrinal conception specifically Jewish." The Rabbis divided all time into *ἄιων ὅυτος*, the age which then was and *ἄιων μέλλων*, the age of glory which was to begin with the resurrection, the days of Messiah's advent and work forming a period of transition from the former to the latter. An expiring period is implied. Moll: "A standing designation for the Messianic time, which brings to an end the present age and introduces the coming one." Neither the Jews nor the Christians of that day recognized the division of Messianic time into two periods, that of the First and that of the Second Advent, the two being in their mind essentially one in form and time. "Hence they included the whole period from the birth of Christ on to his promised coming again 'in the last days.'" Acts 2 : 17; 1 Jno. 2 : 18; Jas. 5 : 3. The expression has not so much a chronological as a doctrinal and a moral import, as is intimated by the demonstrative. Some render "the present age" indicating that the writer and readers were contemporary with Jesus. Others make it equivalent to "the present era," which widens the limit and implies simply that *ἡμεῖς* belong to the Christian period. Some: "the last of these days" indicates that the return of Christ for the consummation of his kingdom was near at hand. A profound consciousness prevailed that with the appearance of Messiah the old order would give way to a new and final epoch. 1 Pet. 1 : 20; Gal. 4 : 4 cf Acts 2 : 17; Jude 18; 2 Pet. 3 : 3; Heb. 9 : 10, 26; cf Dan. 8 : 17-19, 12 : 13. *ἡμῖν*, vs. *πατράσιν*, all who either heard Christ himself or to whom his gospel was published by those who heard him. *ἐν υἱῷ*: At last God has spoken in one who is Son, who is greater than all the prophets, who sustaining the relation of son is qualified as no other to serve as the voice of God. The absence of the article surprises, especially as it is joined with the corresponding *προφήταις* and in view of the author's habit of exact antithesis, cf 3 : 6; 5 : 8; 7 : 8. The omission brings out the unique and exclusive character of the Son-

ship more definitely and more emphatically. The article would place Christ as an individual in opposition to the individual prophets; its absence signalizes a relation borne by no other agent of revelation, a category peculiar to him. He in whom God speaks at the close of the ages sustains to him the relation of son. He is *sui generis*. In him we have, therefore, not a continuance merely of prophetic oracles, but a revelation specifically different from all previous ones, though of course maintaining organic connection with them, proceeding from the same mind.

"Son" is not to be understood here as expressing the relation of the Incarnate to the Father, nor in the sense in which believers are called children of God. Such were, indeed, the prophets, to whom "Son" is placed in direct antithesis. It is clear from vss. 2, 3, that the eternal Logos is meant, who was in the beginning with God, "the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds." He who is ever in the bosom of the Father and is full of grace and truth hath declared Him unto us. Jno. 1 : 14, 17, 18.

Vs. 2. The remainder of the exordium is occupied with the incomparable portrait of the Son, unfolding the profound import of this title, and indicating that since God has at last spoken to us in his Son, he has revealed himself not *πολυμερῶς*, &c., but perfectly and absolutely, the organ of revelation himself possessing divine perfections. The author proceeds to define and amplify the term "Son" by means of seven distinct statements, each of which expresses some sepecific aspect of his unique nature and infinite exaltation, while taken together they set forth particular features of his divine glory in the three periods of his existence: the *pre-incarnate*, when he is represented as the heir, maker and upholder of all things, the effulgence and very image of God; the *incarnate*, when he made expiation for sin; and the *post-incarnate*, when he holds the place of highest dignity and dominion.

The act of the Father constituting him heir of all things did

not coincide with the Son's return to the Father and involve the reward for accomplished redemption. The word *ἐθνήκε* is accounted for by the fact that he was by a specific act destined to be the world's heir, though his entrance upon the inheritance was future.

The thought is not the same as that in 2 : 9; Jno. 17 : 5, but corresponds to the eternal relations of the Godhead, to an ante-temporal act, directed not to the historic Mediator, but to the pre-existent Logos, concurring with the eternal generation, heirship being involved in sonship. The Son is heir from birth, and by virtue of birth, regardless of future contingencies. "If children, then heirs." Rom. 8 : 17; Gal. 4 : 7. He being the only-begotten of the Father, became, of course, exclusively the heir, heir of all things because of his essential being as Son of God. Before the worlds were created he was absolutely preordained to be their Lord. Creation was destined for him. *Κληρονόμος*: The principal idea is not that of possession acquired through another's death, but a permanent possession over which one has full dominion and authority. *πάντων* is not to be restricted to this world, Rom. 4 : 13, cf. 2 : 8. The angels are included, vs. 14.

An additional ground for putting the Son in possession of the universe, is the fact that he was the instrument of its creation. "Through whom also he (God) made the worlds." The Creator is the proper heir and Lord. Creation gives the Son an indefeasible right to possession. The final mediator of God in word, we note, was likewise the primordial mediator in creation. Eternal fitness makes him the ultimate revealer of God and gives the highest sanction to his revelation. *αἰῶνες* cannot refer here to the Gnostic aeons, no trace of which is found in our Ep. That sense of the term was not yet extant. The classic sense is strictly duration of time, but as in the case of its Hebrew equivalent, its sense passed over into the complex idea of "the age with all things belonging to it," the totality of existence in time and space, Eccl. 3 : 11, all the reaches of space and the duration of time. Chap. 11 : 3 clearly determines that not secular periods are meant here, the Mosaic and Christian epochs, but

the universe of space and time. Jno. 1 : 1 ff; Coll. 1 : 15-22. Crem.: "the world as it presents itself in the course of time." Moll: "*αἰών* never signifies time or eternity in the abstract, but both only under the category of progress and movement in which spiritual forces are active," "a system of spiritual relations and powers," the world as existing and moving in time. To the eye it is apparent that *τοῖς αἰῶνας=πάντων* in the previous clause and=*τὰ πάντα*, vs. 3: He owns all things, he made all, he upholds all.

Vs. 3, while continuing the thought of vs. 2, and further explaining the Son's twofold relation to the universe—*ὢν* and *φέρων* correspond respectively to the first and second members of vs. 2—looks also forward and presents reasons for its closing statement, ascribing the Son's enthronement, (1) to his essential timeless relation to the Father and his omnipotent government of the world, which ideas are expressed by present participles, *ὢν*, *φέρων*, since they refer to his pre-existent state, to unalterable and eternal facts, Jno. 3 : 13; (2) to his redeeming work as the Incarnate One, for which the Aorist *ποιησάμενος* is employed, since the reference is to an historical event.

*Απάντασμα* from a verb signifying to shine forth, to emit brightness. The form suggests a passive sense, refulgence, reflection, the reflected image cast by an illuminated body. Lün: "Nicht der Strahl selbst sondern das Resultat desselben." Thay.: "he perfectly reflects the majesty of God." cf. Jno. 12 : 45 (14 : 9). Others prefer effulgence, the radiance or lustre which a shining object throws out from itself, Ausstrahlung, a sun produced from the original light, participating in its essence, yet viewed as now become independent. This was the understanding of all the Fathers, and it evidently underlies the Church's watchword, "Light of Light." The Son is the continual effluence or beaming forth of the Father, his perpetual life-act. The idea is the same as that contained in the Logos, Jno. 1 : 1, and it is illustrated by the doctrine of the eternal generation. "Glory:" the primeval, essential majesty of God, the light inaccessible, 1 Tim. 6 : 16; 1 Jno. 1 : 5, of which the Son is the effluence, the primordial light which is received, concen-



trated, reproduced and in turn beamed forth in the Son, whose distinct, eternal personality represents all that God is: Coll. 2 : 9. Von Gerlach : "As we cannot see the sun without the brightnees which issues from it, so we cannot see the Father without the Only-begotten Son." Both doctrines, that of the distinction of persons and that of the sameness of substance are clearly implied. Del.: "The unfolding by God of his own glory is the forthshining of the Son, who thereby obtains an existence which, though derived, is yet self-subsistent and divine." *Αὐτοῦ* belongs to *δόξης* as well as to *ὑποστάσεως χαρακτήρ*, literally the impression made by a stamp or die as on a coin. Hence any fixed sharply-marked lineaments, by which anything is made recognisable. Moll: "It denotes, partly, the features which in general are the means of recognition, and partly, may indicate the stamp itself as bearing in itself the form to be impressed, and destined to make the impression." The word never means image or copy. The thought is virtually the same as the foregoing, regarded from another point of view. The "doxa" reproduces itself in a form composed of rays, a sun; the "hypostasis" express itself in recognizable features. In the Son we have a distinct, adequate personal expression (*logos*) of the Fathers *ὑποστάσις*. After the fourth century this term was used in the sense of "person," but it is not thus used in our Ep., 3 : 14 ; 11 : 1. It would have been unintelligible to the readers.

It may mean 1. basis, substruction, solidity. 2. standing under, confidence of spirit, steadfastness. 3. what lies at the basis, subject matter. 4. real being over against fancy or illusion. Hence substance, nature, existence. Philo uses it = *οὐσία*. Vulg.: "figure of his substance." The essential being of God is meant, the absolute being without relations. In Christ the invisible God views his own divine substance, the brightness of his glory, the stamp of his nature. Coll. 1 : 15 ; Phil. 2 : 6, cf. Jno. 14 : 9 ; 20 : 28.

*Φέρων*, &c., another immutable divine property of the Redeemer's personality. Del.: "The single *τε* is here employed to combine the assertion of the Son's eternally divine coequal majesty in his relation to God with the assertion of the same in

his relation to the world." The later Jews often call God "the Sustainer of the worlds." On the Son who was the instrument of the world's creation devolves also its maintenance and government. Coll. 1 : 17. The idea of "upholding" has more than a passive sense, and it implies more than that external relation to the world which mythology ascribes to the gods. The Son acts upon and within the world—*τὰ πάντα* (see above), the whole compass of creation—"through the word of his power," by an over-mastering spiritual agency. Num. 11 : 14 ; Deut. 1 : 9 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 21. Power is an inherent attribute of the Son, whether uttered or not. The *ῥημά* is the utterance he chooses to give of it, a word proceeding from power, expressive of, fraught with power. He speaks and it is done ; he commands and it stands fast. All creatures obey his behests. The omnipotent fiat which brought forth creation also continually sustains it and guides it to the realization of its goal. *αὐτοῦ* refers of course to the Son, who is the subject of all these predicates.

"Having made purification of sins." Del.: "The sacred writer, having thus described the enduring background of the Redeemer's work, as formed by the ever-equal and unchangeable glory of the Son, proceeds to that action which formed the prelude of his exaltation in time." The subject denoted by *ὅς* is no longer the eternal Logos exclusively, but, as determined by the predicate of the sentence "having made purification of sin sat down," &c., which describes events occurring in time, the Incarnate One, who united to himself inseparably and forever in one person the nature of man. The conception and phraseology are derived from the Levitical rites, under which sin was viewed as pollution debarring the sinner from God's presence, requiring to be washed away by vicarious sacrifices mediated through a priesthood.

"Purification of sins" is a Greek idiom—the washing away of sins, implying their removal, their effacement, their being purged away, Matt. 8 : 3 ; cf. Lev. 14. *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* is Gen. obj., Exod. 30 : 10 ; Job 7 : 21, referring especially to the purification from all sins on the great day of atonement, Lev. 16 : 19, 30, "thus bringing as definitely before the reader the high-

priestly work of Christ, as the following clause exhibits his kingly office." This purification is not the moral amelioration of society through the personal ministry of Christ by word and example. He put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, 9 : 26. The sins of the world are removed through a gracious act of atonement, a thought perfectly clear to a Jewish-Christian reader in whose mind expiation and purification were synonymous. Exod. 29 : 36 ; 2 Macc. 2 : 16. The capacity for a moral change follows the removal of the barrier between man and God, the fruits of the Spirit are possible only in a heart reconciled to God.

Redemption, like creation, is mentioned as a past act of the Son, *ποιησάμενος*,—Aor., showing the purification to have been completed before the session at the right hand.\* The middle voice implies the immediate relation of the action and the acting subject. Priest and expiatory sacrifice are identified. 7 : 27 ; 10 : 10. An expanded discussion of sacrifice and purification follows later on.

*καθίζειν* is in the older classics ordinarily transitive, and in Paul uniformly with one exception. In Hellenistic use it is generally intransitive, and in our Ep. always, 8 : 1 ; 10 : 12 ; 12 : 2. This makes the exaltation Christ's own act, no less than the act of the Father. The preceding participles forbid the completion of redemption to be viewed as the indispensable ground of the Son's exaltation to the throne. His essential Godhead placed him there from eternity. But he holds that supreme dignity now under new conditions. He was enthroned as the God-man in virtue of his crowning work, the expiation of sin. The cross brought him this ineffable honor. Phil. 2 : 8 ff.

"On the right hand of the majesty," is an expression taken from the Messianic passage, Ps. 110 : 1, and common to our Ep. with Rom. 8 : 34 ; Eph. 1 : 20 ; Coll. 3 : 1. In oriental monarchies the king's son was clothed with royal power and sat with the king on the throne to the right. We find it nowhere applied to the Son's preëxistent state, but always to his theanthropic exaltation after finished redemption. It is the climax following his

---

\*The Vulgate has *faciens*.

self-abasement. Its import is not local, an error corrected in the Scriptures by counter-statements, 4 : 14 ; 7 : 14 ; Eph. 1 : 21 ; 4 : 10 ; Acts 7 : 55,—the right hand of God is everywhere. It signifies the participation of the God-man in the divine dominion and glory, into which he entered as the result of his meritorious and momentous work. He who bore the cross wears the crown. The phrase does not contemplate repose, but mediatorial activity, carried forward in God's immediate presence, made effectual on God's throne where the Mediator asserts supreme and universal dominion, possessing all power in heaven and on earth. Acts 2 : 23 ; Rom. 8 : 34 ; Heb. 8 : 1.

"Majesty" stands for God himself. Since it needs no defining clause *ἐν ὑψηλότητι* is connected with *ἐκάθισεν*, to which it makes an important addition. The plural, cf. Ps. 93 : 4 ; Luke 2 : 14 ; 19 : 38, is explained by the several heavens, in the highest of which sits Christ enthroned. His name is above every name. The hand pierced on Cavalry holds the supreme scepter. Like purification of sins, this phrase points forward to frequent repetitions in the Ep.

Vs. 4 is still a part of the foregoing argument, completing the portrait of Christ by showing his measureless superiority to all other human or divine agents of revelation. *ὁς*, vs. 3, continues to be the subject, he, namely, who is true God, begotten of the Father from eternity being made also true man born of the Virgin Mary, has as God-man become in personality and nature so much greater than the angels as the name peculiar to him is preëminent above theirs. *κρείττων*, a term of relative indefinite comparison, used thirteen times in the Ep., and always denoting a preëminence determined by the context, applied to Christian vs. Jewish features, eternal vs. temporal, and analogous comparisons. Among the Greeks superhuman beings, gods and demi-gods were designated *οἱ κρείττωνες*. Clemens Romanus uses *μείζων* instead: mightier, superior, excelling the angels in power and glory.

*Γενόμενος* falls under the category of time. Vs. 3, with which it stands in apposition, uses the present *ᾧ* in reference to his unchangeable being, while this term refers to a superin-

duced state of the Son in his character as the organ of revelation and the agent of redemption. All that was said previously he is in his essential nature from eternity, what is said of him here he has become in time. The subject of these descriptions comes historically to a position and dignity raised above all others, a change which concerns not his nature, but his condition or mode of existence. Rom. 1 : 3 ; Gal. 4 : 4 ; Phil. 2 : 7. The reference is not to the eternal generation, nor to the incarnation, nor to Christ's investiture with the office of mediator, and still less to an apotheosis or exaltation of man to deity, but to "an actual exaltation of the Incarnate One as such into the place of Deity in the progress of a series of historic events." The context and the author's manifest purpose to demonstrate the superiority of the new dispensation over the old admit only this interpretation. That his earthly sojourn involved for the time a lower state of existence is self-evident and is specially taught in 2 : 7-9.

Kenotic discussions must reckon with this passage. The uncreated Son moved by unfathomable love entered into flesh, exchanging the form of deity for the form of a servant and foregoing in his humiliation the fulness of divine glory. His subsequent exaltation does not, therefore, concern his humanity only, but the entire undivided theanthropic person. His seating himself at the right hand implies also more than a resumption of the infinite glory, Jno. 17 : 5, cf. 14 : 28. The theanthropic Christ, having in the indissoluble union of the two natures, accomplished redemption, attained the majesty peculiar to God.

By "angels" are meant the heavenly spirits. They are introduced abruptly, not only because as the highest order of created intelligence, they form the highest subject of comparison with the incomparable Son, but also because of the Jewish belief that they took part in the mediation of the Mosaic Covenant. 2 : 2 ; Acts 7 : 53. They were organs of the Old Testament ; Christ is the organ of the New Testament. In 2 : 2 the motive for instituting this contrast is disclosed, namely, to enforce practically the inviolable sanctions of the new covenant over against the old. The Old Testament and the New Testament are related

as the angels and the Son. Between them stretches as wide a chasm as between the highest seraphim and the Son of God. In the former created messengers, ministering spirits, communicated the divine will, here the only-begotten of the Father, the embodiment of God, has interpreted Him to man. Jno. 1:18.

*Διάφορος*, excellent, surpassing. The positive already indicates preëminence. The comparative, found only here and 8:6, enhances the idea contained in the positive: a more preëminent, distinguished, singular name, *i. e.* Son, vss. 1 and 5, the name characteristic of his relation to God. The beings contrasted with him are messengers, servants, designations which imply service and subjection, while the former involves co-equal honor, joint-dominion, heirship. Only the Son can be a real heir of God. Hence it is said, he "has inherited" this name. The Perf. instead of the Aor. shows that it relates not to an act parallel to and simultaneous with the seating at the right hand, not to anything given him by ascription or adoption, but to an essential permanent property, something characterizing the preëxistent Logos, the predestined heir of all things, therefore of the highest title; cf. vs. 2, to which it clearly points back. He has been from the beginning, is now, and ever shall be Son. The author had in mind Old Testament prophecies. His readers who were wavering in their Christian faith and disposed to return to the Old Covenant, are assured that already in the prophecies "the Messiah received a name such as was given to no angel, a name which indicates an altogether exclusive and essential relation to God." This interpretation of Ebrard's has this to support it, that the author's appeal to the Old Testament shows not only *his* consciousness of the great difference, but also that his readers must have understood the name Son of God to be applied to the Messiah in a unique sense. The readers would recognize the Son characterized in vss. 1-3 as identical with the Messiah promised in the Old Testament and, therefore, with Jesus Christ.

Some refer it to the complete and final taking possession of that which corresponds with his essential being, that name of

Son which he bears forever challenging universal recognition, Phil. 2 : 9. Camero : He is not said to have inherited the *thing* which belonged to him by nature, but the *name of the thing*, that, viz., by which it was known to angels and men that He Himself was the Son of God."

But angels themselves are called sons in Job 1 : 6 ; 2 : 1 ; 38 : 7 ; Dan. 3 : 25. This apparent contradiction is not solved by charging the author with carelessness, or ignorance of the Scriptures, or of their Hebrew original, which has sons of God where the LXX have angels. Such charges fall from their own weight. He quotes the LXX exclusively, the knowledge and use of which among his readers is accordingly presumed, but he doubtless omitted all express references to the passages in Job and Daniel, since his Hebrew readers were not likely to be misled by the LXX. It must be admitted that the poverty of language requires the use of terms in different senses, and it may readily be shown that the term son is never applied to angels in the sense which it has obviously here. It is not their characteristic name ; it is used only in particular instances. The angels are called sons of God only so far as God is the creative Elohim ; the Messiah is called the Son of God in so far as God is Jehovah. The New Testament offers an effectual solution. Christ bears the name Son peculiarly and exclusively and yet God is bringing many sons to glory, 2 : 10. It makes an essential difference to apply a name in the plural to a class, and in the singular to an individual, ex gr. : In America the title king is applied to no individual, it is claimed by all citizens as a class. The people are sovereign, yet kingship comes to its full manifestation in no individual. Such distinction is made vs. 5. God has addressed no individual angel as "my son."

That God gave in the O. T. a name to the Messiah which implied that he should be of the same nature with the Father, is the import of the particular proofs adduced from the Scriptures, vss. 5-14. While maintaining the infinite superiority of the new dispensation to the old, it is noteworthy that the author in no way disparages the old, but conspicuously makes it the foundation and support of the new. It is a great merit of the former



revelation that it not only predicts the new but also foreshadows its superiority. In it are portrayed the peerless majesty of the Mediator's name, vs. 5, and, commensurate with his incomparable name, the transcendence of his personality in his eternal mode of existence, 6-14. The first proof combines Ps. 2 : 7 with 2 Sam. 7 : 14. The subject of *ἔιπε* is *ὁ θεός*, vs. 1, as also of *εἰσαγάγη*, vs. 6. What angel nearest the throne did God, at any time address thus? *Ποτε* forms a marked antithesis with *πάλιν*. Ebrard: "God has used such expressions to an angel not even a single time; but to the Son not merely once but again and again." It is his peculiar, distinctive, constant name.

The soteriological office and destiny of the Hebrew people and the Messianic import of the theocracy must be kept in mind in the interpretation of the Psalms. These songs of Zion largely interblend the present and the future, political events and Messianic hopes, making the former a type of the latter. While these passages, then, relate to a historic situation in the times of David and Solomon they were understood by David, 2 Sam. 2 : 19, and by Solomon, 1 Kings 8 : 26, 27, as well as by the author and his readers, to have also a deeper prophetic and Messianic sense, to be typical of the person and office of the Mediator. The Jews of that day were accustomed to refer this Psalm to the Messiah, 5 : 5 ; Acts 13 : 33. Otherwise there could have been no force in the writer's application of it. He could appeal to Hebrew consciousness that the perfect outcome of the theocratic relation made the Anointed stand in the relation of Son to the Father. That Son appeared in the person of Jesus and was now enthroned in heaven. Ebrard: "In the very first commencement of the Messianic prophecy [in the narrower sense], there is ascribed to Messiah a relation of Sonship to God, such as is never applied, even approximately, to any one of the angels," a name which in that absolute sense no other one could bear but he. Spoken to David these words were intended solely for Christ, who derives his real being from God. "I, and no other, myself have begotten thee." The "to-day," when he derived his being from God has been interpreted as

pointing to the miraculous conception, or to the eternal generation. The latter view seems to be favored by the context, vs. 2, "through whom he also made the worlds." But he was called Son only in his historico-soteriological office. He received this name in reference to his Messianic destiny. Delitzsch: "the begetting must be a begetting into royal existence, which is the inward reality symbolized by the anointing." He refers it accordingly to the Lord's entrance into the royal estate of divine and supermundane glory, at the moment of the resurrection. Acts 13 : 33; Rom. 1 : 4; Coll. 1 : 18; Rev. 1 : 5.

*Kai pálin*, to take another instance. This citation from 2 Sam. 7 : 14, which in fact is the germ and soul of all the future Messianic prophecies, likewise, shows the unique reciprocal relation between Jehovah and the seed of David, God using language which he never once addressed to an angel, but to the Son again and again. Historically this promise pointed to Solomon, but it has its complete and Messianic fulfilment only in him who was at once Son of David and Son of God, who indeed builds the House of God.

The Son having received a higher name than the angels, there follows, vs. 6, a third quotation demonstrating his superior rank to the angels. The passage is one of extreme difficulty. Many expositors explain *pálin* as simply introducing a fresh quotation and connect it with *léγει*, justifying this rendering by a hyperbaton: "And again when he brings in," &c. This exposition which avoids the enigma of the "two bringings in" is both grammatically and exegetically untenable. The only rendering warranted by grammar is "when he shall have again brought in," &c. Delitzsch: "When thus introducing a new citation *pálin* always stands elsewhere in the Epistle (as in the rest of the New Testament and in Philo) at the beginning of the sentence." 2 : 13; 4 : 5; 10 : 30. The reference is clearly to the Second Coming. The antithesis between vss. 5 and 6 indicated by *δέ* is that of the First and Second Advent, the first having closed with the "filial relation of the man Christ Jesus to the Heavenly Father which resulted from the resurrection," *i. e.* his entrance on the kingly state; while the second will be inaugurated

by the visible reintroduction of the Risen One from his supramundane being into the world. This rendering is further justified by the fact (a) that *εἰσαγεῖν* is the sole word used by the LXX for introducing the children of Israel into the promised inheritance and for their second introduction or restoration after the exile, and is also used of the ultimate restoration of Israel; (b) that chap. 2 views the Son as holding for a time in his historical manifestation a rank below the angels, "while their subjection to him is always in the New Testament connected with the state of exaltation." Phil. 2 : 9; Eph. 1 : 20-22; 1 Pet. 3 : 21; (c) *πρωτότοκος*, although referring at Coll 1 : 15; Ps. 89 : 27, to the cosmical position of the Son is really his title as the Risen One, Coll. 1 : 18; Rom. 8 : 29; Rev. 1 : 5, implying a primacy both of time and rank, and pointing to the glorious inheritance into which the Father will bring him at the Parousia when he will summon all the angels to worship the First-born of the new humanity, *i. e.*, of the risen dead.

"He says:" what will infallibly be spoken, "a logical future," stands already fixed in Scripture. "And let all the angels," &c., is found with a slight variation in Ps. 97 : 7. It is contained literally in the LXX in Deut. 32 : 43, but omitted in our present Heb. text. If taken from the Ps. it is obviously a false translation. On the other hand the text used by the LXX was a recension at least equally ancient with the Masoretic. It doubtless contained our clause and Ps. 97 : 7 may be a reference to Deut. 32 : 43, whence it is also quoted by Justin Martyr. Furthermore the Ps. contains no allusion to the bringing in of the first-born, whereas in Deut. the context is an exultant description of God's victory over his enemies and the re-deliverance of his people. It thus foreshadows that transcendent triumph by which the Son of God will be ushered into the world as its Conqueror and Lord. "When Moses sang that song, Israel, who in Hos. 11 : 1 is called the first-born of God, was just about to enter as a people among the nations of the earth." (Ebrard.)

In the original it is Jehovah who is to be thus worshiped, and to the Christian readers of the Ep. it was well known

that the Jehovah who should arise for the salvation of his people would dwell in the Messiah. That the latter would be the living presence of God was a common idea of the Old Testament, and New Testament writers are fully conscious of the fact that Jehovah manifested in the flesh is Jesus Christ. cf. Is. 9 : 5. Del.: "The ancient synagogue recognized Jehovah as one of the names of Messiah."

7-12 offer a third argument for the superior rank of the Son from the Old Testament. 7-9 present the direct contrast *πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, etc., *πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν*. The address to the former is viewed by some as indirect, to the latter as direct, but Delitzsch takes *πρὸς* in both clauses—"in reference to." *πνεύματα* in accordance with the entire passage of which this forms a part, Ps. 104 : 1 ff, and especially in harmony with *πυρὸς φλόγα*, must be rendered winds. The angels which are spirits, vs. 14, "He maketh into winds," &c. The Heb. seems to require the translation "who maketh winds his angels and flames of fire his ministers." The Psalm lauds Jehovah as Creator and Lord of universal nature with a retrospective glance at the creation of light, the firmament, upper waters, (Gen. 1 : 17,) winds, fire. He makes the light his garment, the heavens his tent, the clouds his chariot, who walketh, &c. Naturally our citation follows: the winds his messengers, the lightning his ministers. However, by prefixing the article, the Greek, it is claimed, gives to the clause another sense, and our author follows this Greek version which can only be rendered by "maketh his angels winds," &c. Alford and others hold this to be really the sense of the original, correctly understood by the LXX and our author. The order of the Hebrew words differs from that in the previous verse, which speak of Him making the clouds his chariot. The sense is, He turns his angels into winds and flames, employs them under the agency and form of winds and flames. This harmonizes with the context: "Who maketh the clouds his chariot, who walketh upon the wings of the wind, namely, by making His angels winds, using them as He does the storm and the lightning. "His messengers are to be recognized in winds and lightning," von Hoffman. It was a common idea among the Rabbins that

angels in their ministries might be transformed into the elements. cf. Rom. 8 : 38 ; 1 Pet. 3 : 22. *λειτουργός* = *αγγέλος*.

The angels serve, the Son reigns : "Thy throne, O God, is forever," &c., quoted from Ps. 45 : 7, 8. It describes a royal marriage, but it always received a Messianic explanation from the Rabbins, who indeed often gave a Messianic interpretation to passages addressed to God.

*ὁ θεός* is vocative. So in the Heb. which uses the nominative for it. "O God : " The Son, *i. e.* the Messiah, is addressed as God by God himself. His divine name and throne are correlated with the angelic worship demanded for him. Unitarians admit this rendering but they explain away the force of *θεός*. The sense and spirit of the Hebrew language, however, do not allow the idea of God to be degraded to the idea of creature majesty. Such terms were applied to Solomon and other theocratic kings not only because of the divine authority vested in them, but because as divine representatives they were hailed for a time as the realization of Israel's longings for the promised Messiah. As disappointment succeeded disappointment, the whole line of kings falling miserably short of the Messianic ideal, their hopes were finally concentrated on the person of a future David, "great David's greater Son." Having failed of fulfilment in the subjects immediately described by them, the ideas delineated by psalmists and prophets came to be viewed as transcending common history, as picturing a great Messianic King of the future. Sung in the temple liturgy and thus separated from their historic occasion and literal sense, these strains underwent a spiritual metamorphosis, they became Messianic hymns having not merely a typical but a directly prophetic character. Solomon was a real, a living prophecy of Christ, his typico-ideal prefiguration. What was only very imperfectly fulfilled in Solomon is perfectly fulfilled in Christ. There is found, too, throughout the Old Testament an unmistakable presentiment of the Messiah bearing uniquely within himself a union of the human and the divine. The incarnation is still veiled "yet the two great lines of prophecy running through it—one leading on to a final manifestation of Jehovah, the other to the ad-

vent of a Son of David—do so meet and coalesce at certain focal points, as by the light thus generated to burst through the veil." Cf. Is. 9 : 5 ; 11 : 2 ; Jer. 23 : 6. Del.: "It was part of the faith of the Old Testament that the mighty God, the just God and the justifier, would hereafter manifest himself in bodily form in the person of Messiah." This Ps. was viewed as a prophecy as early as the days of Jehosaphat. Our author had accordingly a clear warrant for his interpretation of it and his application of *ὁ θεός* to the Messiah who has appeared in Jesus Christ. And surely one twice (9) thus addressed must have a transcendent rank and his revelation must possess the highest sanctions.

9 points to the dominion of God over Israel, represented especially by Solomon's righteous execution of judgment, 1 Ki. 3 : 9, as issuing in the dominion of his Anointed. The analogy with 8 makes Elohim in the original again vocative. Judges are called Elohim, Exod. 21 : 6 ; 22 : 7, 8 ; Ps. 82 : 1, 6, and the majesty of righteous judgment is an expression of the majesty of God, the power which makes for righteousness. Rom. 14 : 17. Righteousness is beginning and end of Christ's Kingdom. The citation embraces both the divine and the human side of the great King, the former in the term God, the latter in his being anointed. He ranks accordingly above his "associates:" not the angels, with whom the Psalm institutes no comparison, and they are not anointed ones ; nor those holding office about the King, who are always inferiors ; but "thy fellows" in royal dignity, other rulers or judges, divinely-ordained authorities, "above whom the Divine King is thus immeasurably raised." 1 Ki. 3 : 13. "Anointing with the oil of joy" at festivals, Ps. 23 : 5 ; 92 : 10 ; Matt. 6 : 17, symbolizes the overflow of God's blessing. For his love of righteousness and his hatred of iniquity God has crowned him with more joy, prosperity and glory than any other ruler. He has no equal. His title *θεός* shows him to stand "in the relation of kindred Godhead to God himself." Thus his divine name, his imperishable Kingdom, his perfect execution of the moral law raise Christ to an infinite height above the angels.

## ARTICLE IV.

## ON THE DAY OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF OUR LORD.

BY REV. CHARLES W. HEISLER, A. M.

The date of the Crucifixion has reference to the hour of the day, the day of the week, the day of the month, and the year.

Without entering into details at this point we content ourselves with the statement that the most probable year of Christ's death, according to the best authorities is A. U. C. 783, A. D. 30.

The *day of the week* is almost universally conceded to be Friday. Dr. Edersheim says, "At the outset it is admitted on both sides, \*that our Lord was crucified on Friday and rose on Sunday.'" Dr. Andrews writes, "It is admitted on all sides, and therefore need not here be considered, that Jesus died on Friday, in the afternoon."† The testimony upon this point is almost uniformly affirmative. Still there are some notable exceptions. Dr. Westcott, the present Bishop of Durham maintains with great acuteness, that Thursday was the day of the Crucifixion. Whilst admitting with scholars generally, that Jesus' death occurred on the *Paraskeue*—the Preparation—he maintains in opposition to them, that this Preparation was not that for the Passover Sabbath, but for the Passover meal. "In point of grammar, *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*—the Preparation of the Passover—*might mean the Friday in the Paschal week*; but it seems incredible, if we take into consideration the significance of St. John's dates, that the Evangelist should reckon by the week and not by the symbolic feast, of which he is recording the fulfillment. In connection with the whole narrative, 'the Preparation of the Passover' cannot mean anything but the 'Preparation for the Passover,' or in other words the 14th Nisan."‡ But Dr.

\*The Temple, p. 341.

†Life of our Lord, p 461, Rev. Ed.

‡Introd. to the Gospels, p. 336.



Westcott's arguments have not gained any wide acceptance among scholars.

Some years ago Rev. Dr. Seyffarth, an eminent archaeologist, published a volume in which he strongly contended for Thursday as the day of the Crucifixion. "He affirms that the earliest Christian Churches, those which were founded by the Apostles themselves, always commemorated the *Passio*, by which they meant the whole space of time between the Crucifixion and the resurrection, upon the 19th, 20th, 21st and 22nd of March, thus assigning the death of Christ to the 19th or Thursday; and that the opinion that Christ was crucified on Friday\* "had its origin in the oldest Christian communions, in that they devoted Friday to mourning and fasting, because it came immediately after and during the inhumation of Christ's body."\*

I have been recently informed that Thomas Newberry, the eminent author of the Englishman's Bible, who has devoted fifty years to the study of the Scriptures, takes the view also that Thursday was the day of Christ's death.

Perhaps the passage most relied upon for proving that Thursday must have been the day of the Crucifixion is Matt. 12 : 40, where it is claimed Christ plainly predicts that "the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." It is insisted that whilst the Jewish mode of reckoning parts of days as full days *may* account for the "three days," yet it will not account for the "three nights." But to this it may be replied that Jewish usage, like our own, employs an expression of this kind for the more general term of a day simply. It is suggested then that the phrase "three days and three nights" is simply equivalent to "three days," and it is undeniable that the circumstances of the case would satisfy this term, according to the Jewish methods of computation. But over against this one passage, which on the surface seems to favor Thursday, are a number which almost absolutely prohibit it.

The testimony of the sacred writers is full, explicit, and positive to the effect that Christ rose from the dead on the third day after his crucifixion. Our Lord himself predicted that he

---

\*Quoted from the *Lutheran*.

would rise the third day, Matt. 16 : 21 ; 17 : 23 ; 20 : 19 ; Luke 9 : 22 ; 18 : 33. After his resurrection Christ says to the assembled disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day," Luke 24 : 46. The angel at the empty tomb recalls to the minds of the women the words of Jesus prior to his death as to his rising on the third day.\* The two disciples on the way to Emmaus, that eventful first Lord's day, in their conversation with the supposed stranger, sadly say, as though amidst all the darkness and despair of the crucifixion there lingered in the breasts of some of them a glimmering hope that he might return to life, "To-day is the third day since these things were done."† And yet at that moment they were speaking with the risen Lord. St. Peter testifies that Christ arose on the third day.‡ Similarly St. Paul.§ In every one of the passages above cited the Greek is correctly rendered by "*the third day.*" The term "after three days" occurs in Mk. 8 : 31 ; 9 : 31 and 10 : 34, where in the corresponding passages Matthew and Luke employ the "*third day.*"||

This usage of Mark is certainly explicable on the basis of the Jewish mode of reckoning time. This appears from Matt. 27 : 63 compared with 27 : 64, where the chief priests and Pharisees coming to Pilate say, "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, 'After three days I will rise again.' Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until *the third day.*" The chief priests certainly understood Christ to predict that his resurrection would occur on the third day. Before the high-priest they charge Jesus with having said, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and *within three days* I will build another made without hands."¶ Referring now to John 2 : 19 where Jesus made that memorable statement about the temple of his body, we read "Destroy this temple, and *in three days* I will raise it up." The Greek preposition is "in" and in respect to this Winer observes, "where it [*ἐν*] signifies *within*, John 2 : 19, it may also be rendered by *in*, and

\*Luke 24 : 7. †Luke 24 : 21. ‡Acts 10 : 40. §1 Cor. 15 : 3.

||Matt. 16 : 21 ; 17 : 23 ; 20 : 19 ; Luke 9 : 22 and 18 : 33.

¶Mark 14 : 58.

then differs obviously from *δύο*; for *in three days* does not mean that three whole days are to be spent on something, but only that something is to take place *within* that space of time, consequently before its expiration."\* It seems clear then that Jesus rose the third day after his death.

The next point is whether this *third day* would be better satisfied by Thursday than by Friday. In other words, if Jesus died on Thursday and rose on Sunday could it be strictly said that he rose on the third day? Would Jewish usage sanction such as interpretation of *third day*?

It is clear that the Jews used both the *inclusive* and *exclusive* mode of reckoning time, as for example Luke 9 : 28 compared with Matt. 17 : 1 and Mk. 9 : 2. See also John 20 : 26. But it seems that the inclusive mode was the more common. According to this "the third day" from to-day will be the day after to-morrow. To-day is one day, to-morrow is the next day, day after to-morrow is the third day. The two disciples said, "To-day is the third day since these things were done."† Christ's usage seems to be decisive on this point, "Behold I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and *the third day* I shall be perfected."‡ The same usage apparently obtains in the account of St. Paul's voyage. The first day they set sail from Crete, and ran under Clauda; the next they lightened the ship; the *third day*, presumably the day following the "next day" of v. 18, "they cast out the tackling."§ Evidence on the same point seems to be presented by John 2 : 1 compared with John 1 : 43. If we allow the day of 1 : 43 and a following day for the journey into Galilee, our Lord would arrive at Cana, for the wedding, the third day. And it is agreed that it is just a two days' journey. This last argument is simply suggestive. Meyer claims that the day of John 2 : 1 is the sixth from John 1 : 19, which agrees with the view above given.

Apart from this the inclusive mode of reckoning was well known, and it is not entirely unknown among us. From Friday at 3 p. m. to 6 p. m. would be part of one day; from that

\*Gram. p. 385 f. †Luke 24 : 21. ‡Luke 13 : 32. §Acts 27 : 13-19.

to Saturday 6 p. m. would be the second day; from Saturday at 6 p. m. began the third day. But if Jesus had died on Thursday it would be the *fourth* day. The following seems to me an excellent statement of this point: "In fact we have to deal with the curious custom of inclusive reckoning. It appears to me that inclusive reckoning was the inveterate habit of the vulgar, but that the lawyers in legal documents where ambiguity would be fatal, avoided it. Hence in the Pentateuch numbers are used as we use them. "Seven days of unleavened bread," for example, are calculated from the 14th day of the month at even' until the 21st day of the month at even'. (Ex. 12 : 18.) Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, I am told, exhibit both uses: in legal documents exclusive reckoning prevails, but in ordinary life great confusion and ambiguity exist from the preference for inclusive figures. How inveterate the error was is shown by the Roman method of calculating the days of the month. They reckoned backwards and always inclusively. Thus the last day of April, for example, was called the day before the Kalends of May, and the last day but one the third day before the Kalends of May, though it surely ought to be called the second. The same with the Nones and the Ides. Even older than this was the weekly market. It was held every eighth day, but was called '*nundinae*,' the ninth day, instead of the eighth. Any one may see by consulting a concordance that the common Biblical expression of 'the third day' signifies wherever we can test its meaning, 'the day after to-morrow.' The Hebraist knows that 'heretofore' is expressed by two nouns, 'yesterday and the day before,' literally 'yesterday and the third day.' In Latin *nudius tertius*, 'it is now the third day,' means 'the day before yesterday.' " \*

We conclude then that Friday was undoubtedly the day of the Crucifixion. "The ancient Christians uniformly held that Friday was the day of Christ's death. Modern Greeks still call Friday 'Preparation.' " †

*The day of the month.* Was Christ crucified on the 14th or the

\*Rev. Arthur Wright in *Biblical World*, Aug. 1893, p. 110 f.

†Id. p. 112.

15th of Nisan? A very trivial question at first sight, apparently, but it involves very important consequences. The settlement of this question really depends upon another,—whether Christ observed the true Jewish Passover feast at the proper time, *i. e.*, on the evening following the 14th of Nisan. The principal theories may be stated as follows :

1. Jesus' last meal with his disciples was a true Passover, celebrated at the legal time, *i. e.*, on the evening following the 14th of Nisan, and after the beginning of the 15th; and hence he was crucified on the 15th of Nisan, the next day, according to our mode of reckoning. This theory is held by Robinson, Andrews, Edersheim, Weisler, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Norton, Keil, Schaff, Milligan, Plumptre, and many others.

2. Jesus ate a meal with his disciples on the evening following the 13th of Nisan, and was crucified, therefore, on the 14th at the very hour of the slaying of the Paschal lamb. This was hence not a true Passover, and must have been either a common meal at which he instituted the Lord's Supper, or an *anticipatory* Paschal Supper. This theory with some variations is held by Westcott, Greswell, Farrar, Kraft, Ellicott, Lindsay, Norris, Sepp, Aldrich, Godet, Bleek, Meyer, DeWette, Stier.

3. Modifications of these two theories are proposed by some.

(a) Some maintain that there were two legal days for keeping the Passover, according as the first day of the month was determined by astronomical calculation, or by ocular observation. The Pharisees observed one of these days, the Sadducees the other. Christ kept the Passover on the day observed by the Sadducees, the Pharisees on the other day. But Dr. Andrews, on the authority of Winer and Paulus, claims that "if such a difference in the mode of computation did actually exist between the Rabbinites and the Karaites after the destruction of Jerusalem, there is no proof that it did before."\*

(b) Christ ate the Passover at the proper time, according to another theory, *i. e.* on the evening following the 14th of Nisan, but the chief-priests and Pharisees were so busily engaged in en-

---

\**Life of our Lord*, p. 457.

compassing the arrest and death of Jesus that they delayed eating it until the next day. Thus John 18 : 28 is to be explained. After the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus, they ate the Passover, "turning the supper into a breakfast," according to some. Of this, Dr. Edersheim observes, "Among the various objections to this extraordinary hypothesis, this one will be sufficient, that such would have been absolutely contrary to one of the plainest rubrical directions, which has it, 'The Passover is not eaten but during the night, nor yet later than the middle of the night.'"<sup>\*</sup> Dr. Andrews says "it is so intrinsically improbable that it now finds no defenders."<sup>†</sup> About the same may be said of another form of this theory, presented with great ingenuity by Mr. Matislaw, that the first day of unleavened bread might be extended from 3 P. M. of Thursday to sunset of Friday, at any time during which the Paschal lamb could be slain, and eaten after sunset of Friday. He would thus extend the meaning of the phrase "between the two evenings" to the largest possible limit.<sup>‡</sup>

(c) Calvin held that as the 15th fell upon a Friday that year, it would bring two Sabbaths, a feast-Sabbath and a weekly Sabbath together. In that case the Jews postponed the Passover sacrifice to the 15th. But Jesus observed the legal time on the evening following the 14th. The evidence all seems to be that such regulations were refinements of the rabbis posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem. This could not have been observed in Christ's time. "The suggestion, that in that year the Sanhedrin had postponed the Paschal Supper from Thursday evening (the 14th-15th Nisan) to Friday evening (15th-16th Nisan), so as to avoid the Sabbath following on the first day of the feast—and that the Paschal Lamb was therefore in that year eaten on Friday, the evening of the day on which Jesus was crucified, is an assumption void of all support in history or Jewish tradition."<sup>§</sup>

In the consideration of the day of the month on which Christ was crucified, two questions present themselves for examination.

<sup>\*</sup>II., p. 482.

<sup>†</sup>Life of our Lord, p. 459.

<sup>‡</sup>Alford, I., p. 889.

<sup>§</sup>Edersheim, II, 481.

Was the Supper recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke the Passover?

Was the Supper of John identical with this?

1. Was the Supper of the Synoptists a true Paschal Supper? The passages referring to this event are Matt. 26 : 2, 17, 20, 30; Mark 14 : 1, 12, 17, 26; Luke 22 : 1, 7, 14, 15.

(1) The announcement by Jesus of the approach of the Passover, Matt. 26 : 2; Mk. 14 : 1, with the direct statement of Luke, 22 : 1, and the preparations ordered by our Lord, on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the very day on which the Paschal lamb was killed, Matt. 26 : 17 f., Mk. 14 : 12 f.; Luke 22 : 7, make it undeniable that the supper Christ ate with his disciples that evening was the Paschal Supper. The Paschal lamb was slain on the 14th Nisan, Ex. 12 : 6. The supper occurs that same evening, Mt. 26 : 20, Mk. 14 : 17, Luke 22 : 14, in accordance with the legal requirements of Ex. 12 : 8, Numbers 9 : 3, 11.

(2) Our Lord expressly calls the meal they were then eating the Passover, Luke 22 : 15, and all the circumstances confirm it.

The conclusion is irresistible that this Supper of the Synoptists was the true Paschal Supper, observed at the proper time, *i. e.*, on the evening following the 14th of Nisan. There is indeed little difference of opinion on this point. "The Synoptic Gospels undoubtedly place the last supper on the Paschal night."\* "Their language on its face clearly affirms 'that the Synoptists put the supper on the evening following the 14th Nisan.' The attempts so to interpret these statements as to make them refer to an anticipatory supper on the evening following the 13th Nisan are very forced and unsatisfactory, since neither according to the law nor to usage was the Paschal lamb slain on that day."† Robinson is very pronounced: "Had we only the testimony of the first three evangelists, not a doubt upon this question could ever arise. Their language is full, explicit and decisive, to the effect that our Lord's last meal with his disciples was the regular and ordinary Paschal Supper of the Jews, introducing the festival of unleavened bread, or the evening after the 14th of Nisan."‡

\*Edersheim, *Temple*, 344.

†Andrews, 461, 462.

‡Harmony 189.



"It is almost impossible to imagine anything more evident, than that he [Luke] wishes us to understand that Jesus was about to celebrate the ordinary Jewish Paschal Supper. \* \* No ingenuity can explain away these facts." [viz. in Luke 22 : 7, 13, 14, 15.]\* Meyer admits that the Synoptists represent Christ as keeping the Passover on Thursday evening following Nisan 14th. But he says, "According to John's account, the last meal of which Jesus partook, was not that of the Passover, while his death is represented as having taken place on the day before the feast, the day which Matthew calls the first day of unleavened bread." This he calls "a great and irreconcilable discrepancy."† That it is so many eminent scholars deny, as we shall see. Lange says, "These words are express against the ancient notion that Jesus celebrated the Passover a day earlier."‡ Farrar's testimony is interesting: "Now it must be admitted that the Synoptists are unanimous in the use of expressions which admit of no natural explanation except on the supposition that the Passover *did* begin on the evening of Thursday, and therefore that Thursday was Nisan 14th, and that the Last Supper was in reality the ordinary Paschal feast."§ "The evidence they (Matt., Mk. and Luke) give is abundant and explicit to the effect that Jesus ate the regular Paschal Supper on the evening of the 14th Nisan."|| Dr. Schaff is pronounced in confirmation of the foregoing. It is unnecessary to multiply testimonies on this point. We may accept our first question as definitely and emphatically answered, that according to Matthew, Mark and Luke, our Lord ate the true Paschal Supper at the proper time, that is on the evening following the 14th of Nisan, after the beginning of the 15th, and hence that he was crucified on the 15th. No reasonable man with the first three gospels before him can well take any other position.

2. The second question presents itself, was the supper of John identical with that of the Synoptists? The issue here is plainly marked. Many, perhaps the majority of harmonists, and

\*Edersheim, II., 481. †On Matthew p. 457 f. ‡On Matthew 26 : 17. §Life of Christ, II., p. 475. ||Dr. A. T. Robertson, in Broadus' Harmony, p. 253.

of exegetes, assert their identity, and that there is hence no discrepancy between John and the other three Evangelists.

On the other hand many eminent exegetes boldly allege that they are not the same. Meyer, positively so: "On the 14th Nisan, in the evening, the festival commenced with the *Paschal* meal, *after* Jesus had been crucified on the afternoon of the same day. Such is the view of John."\* From the present passage \* \* already appears the irreconcilable difference between John and the Synoptists in respect of the day of Jesus' death."† Weiss insists that John's account diverges from the Synoptists' and is to be preferred. "It is scarcely possible," he says, "to avoid seeing a reference to the mistaken account by the older Evangelists, when John expressly states that Jesus took his last meal with his disciples before the feast of the Passover, *i. e.* on the evening of the 13th day of Nisan (John 13:1).‡

Dr. Westcott§ maintains, however, that there is no discrepancy between John and the Synoptists, but that John gives us the true time and the statements of the other Evangelists must be interpreted accordingly. But his explanations seem to us singularly forced. Farrar thinks the Synoptists fell into an error in their records, which St. John deliberately corrected. He sums up; "that this supper was not, and was not intended to be, the actual *Paschal* meal, which neither was nor could be legally eaten till the *following* evening; but by a perfectly natural identification, and one which would have been regarded as unimportant, the Last Supper, *which was a quasi-Passover, a new and Christian Passover* \* \* got to be identified, even in the memory of the Synoptists, with the Jewish Passover, and that St. John, silently and deliberately, corrected this erroneous impression, which, even in his time, had come to be generally prevalent."|| But where does St. John clearly make such correction? If he intended to do so, we say it reverently, he has certainly carried out his purpose in a very bungling manner. That the first three Evangelists should have fallen into an error on this point, so soon after the occurrence of the alleged facts, and that

\*On John, p. 386.

†Ibid. p. 387.

‡Life of Christ, III., 275.

§Intro. to Gospels, p. 338.

||I. p. 482.

this error had become widely prevalent by the time St. John wrote his gospel is almost absolutely incredible. If an error on such a point could gain such general prevalence in so short a time, it is hard to understand how the records of the Synoptists can be accepted as reliable on any point. If St. John meant to correct this "erroneous impression" of Matthew, Mark and Luke, he certainly must have been familiar with the contents of their gospels, and that he should attempt a correction in the vague, indefinite, unsatisfactory manner in which it is claimed he has done so, is scarcely conceivable. As Dr. Robinson well says: "Did John believe that their [the Synoptists'] testimony on this point was wrong, and did he mean to correct it? If so, we should naturally expect to find some notice of the correction along with the mention of the meal itself, which John describes as well as they. Indeed, that would have been the appropriate and only fitting place for such a correction. But John has nothing of the kind; and we are therefore authorized to maintain that it was not John's purpose thus and there to correct or contradict the testimony of the other Evangelists; and if not there, then much less by mere implication in other places and connections."\* "It is his [John's] habit perhaps," says Dr. Kendrick,† "beyond that of either of his fellow-Evangelists, to give in his history definite designations of time, \* \* and now when a very serious point of chronology was involved, and he was going consciously to correct a widely diffused error of the Synoptists in regard to the time of the Lord's Supper, that he should have satisfied himself with this vague and indefinite language seems incredible." The hyper-critical theory, *i. e.* of an irreconcilable discrepancy is scarcely any worse than this.

It is to be remembered that St. John's gospel was written considerably after the others; and that it is largely supplemental in character. He supplies many details omitted by the other evangelists, and omits many incidents narrated more at length by them. For example, he gives us no detailed account of the institution of the Holy Supper. He does not definitely state

\*Harmony, p. 190,

†In Meyer on John, p. 403.

that the Last Supper was the Paschal meal, but his whole account presupposes this. A close study of his narrative ought to convince any one, who has no pet theories as to the origin and composition of the gospels to maintain, that it was the Paschal Supper. All the attendant circumstances make it equally clear that this supper is identical with that of the Synoptists. "There can be no reasonable doubt that this meal was the same as that at which the Lord's Supper was instituted as related in the three evangelists."\* Consult John 13 : 2, 4, 26, 27, 30; 18 : 1. But let us examine the arguments urged in proof that this was not the Paschal Supper, and hence that, according to John, Christ was crucified on Nisan 14th. It is claimed "If we read St. John's gospel alone, no one would doubt that our Lord was crucified on the 14th, and therefore did not partake of the Passover."†

(1) It is argued that John 13 : 4 fixes the time of this supper as before the Paschal meal. The strength of this argument lies in the force of the preposition "before," and the interval of time it indicates. It is taken to mean at least a day before. But this is certainly straining a point to accommodate a theory. Meyer calls it "an arbitrary assumption."‡ It may be used very indefinitely, as with us, and instead of a day or so before, may mean an unappreciable interval prior to, *i. e.* in general at the same time. Before the Paschal meal had rightly begun, "he riseth," &c., and yet this could be said to have taken place "during supper." We use the preposition in this manner. The phrase "before the feast of the Passover" is often taken to modify the main proposition. But it is maintained that it may modify either of the subordinate propositions. Norton translates it, "But Jesus, before the feast of the Passover, knew that the hour had come for him to pass from the world to the Father, and having loved his own who were to remain in this world, he loved them to the last."§ "We conclude then," says Dr. Andrews in his extended and excellent discussion of this point, "that from the note of time 'before the feast of the Passover;' nothing definite in regard to the time of the Supper can

\*Alford I., p. 840. †Wright in *Biblical World*, Sept. 1893. ‡On John 486

§Andrews, p. 466.

be determined."\* It seems very strange that this phrase should be interpreted to fix the date of what follows, especially in view of the strong evidence that the Supper that follows this statement was the Paschal meal. But if strict exegesis determines that this phrase does refer to a time prior to the feast of the Passover—as we believe it does not—yet it may be urged that St. John almost habitually used the term "feast of the Passover" in a wider sense to include the whole festival of unleavened bread. It is claimed by some that ordinary Jewish usage counted the first day of the feast not from sunset of the 14th but from the morning of the 15th. Schaff observes, "before the feast of the Passover," does not mean a day before (which would have been so expressed, compare 12 : 1) but a short time before, and refers to the commencement of the 15th Nisan."† In this sense all ground for doubt or the assertion of discrepancy disappears. Robinson, whose judgment is entitled to great weight, is very decided: "In this view, the phrase in question does not mean 'before the Paschal Supper,' but 'before the festival of the Passover,' that is, of unleavened bread. (Luke 22 : 1). It is equivalent therefore to the English *festival-eve*; and here marks the evening before the *festival* proper of seven days' continuance. \* \* It is therefore evident that this passage does not sustain the inference attempted to be drawn from it."‡ Dr. Robinson§ is equally strenuous in maintaining that John 13 : 1 fairly interpreted offers no argument that this supper was not the Paschal meal. We feel warranted in concluding then that this passage *does not* prove that the supper of John took place before the Passover Supper.

(2) The second argument usually employed to prove that this was not the Paschal Supper is derived from John 13 : 29, where, upon the departure of Judas from the supper-room, some of the disciples supposed that Jesus had privately told him to purchase some articles necessary for the feast, or to make some provision for the poor. It is urged that this mere supposition proves that this meal was not the Paschal feast, for how could the disciples

\*Id., 467.

†Harmony, 190.

‡Christ. Church, Vol. I., p. 134.

§Broadus' Harmony, p. 255.

suppose Judas was to purchase something for the Paschal Supper, if that supper was already in progress? Westcott: "On the 15th such purchases would have been equally illegal and impossible."\* Weiss: "Now, such a supposition would be clearly impossible if the feast had already begun with the meal for which such purchases were chiefly necessary; and on the eve of the feast when each one was obliged to sit at the festive supper, no buying and selling could have been thought of. The alms to be distributed were, of course, intended to provide a Paschal Supper for the poor."† This last statement of Weiss is entirely gratuitous. Meyer takes the same ground,‡ as against Weiseler, Tholuck, Lange, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Bleck and others. Farrar holds to the same view with Meyer and Weiss. This is the line of argument. But to this it may be replied:

(a) That the disciples merely *supposed* that Jesus said something of this kind to Judas. Jesus had said, v. 27, "That thou doest, do quickly." The disciples evidently heard that, but they did not know "for what intent he spake this unto him." They simply supposed Jesus had said one of two things, either of which, as will appear later on, was possible, and might have been probable at that time. "In the confusion and excitement of the scene such a mistake was not unintelligible."§

(b) This argument proceeds upon the assumption that "feast" in this verse necessarily means the Paschal Supper. But it *may* mean the whole festival, having particular reference to the part of the feast yet to come. A collation of all the passages in John's gospel translated "feast" as referring to the Passover seems to indicate that he generally uses the term not of the Paschal Supper, but of the whole festival. This certainly is true in John 2 : 23, which the revisers have rendered "during the feast," *i. e.* the whole Passover festival. So also in 6 : 4; 11 : 56. It can scarcely mean anything else in 12 : 12, 20, and a common-sense interpretation of 13 : 1 would render it similarly there. This general usage of St. John is accounted for by scholars on the ground that he wrote later than the other evangelists and after

\*Intro., p. 338. †III., 275. ‡On John, 398.

§Edersheim, Temple, 346.

the destruction. "To him the Jews were no more the holy people of God. Rejecting Jesus, and afterwards his apostles, they had themselves been rejected. Everywhere he speaks of them distinctly as 'the Jews,' formerly the Church of God, but now cut off, and as a body standing in a hostile attitude to Christ, and to that new, universal church, composed both of Jews and Gentiles, of which he was the head."\*

This whole argument is strengthened by a consideration of the peculiar offerings of the 15th Nisan called the Chogigah. Edersheim writes, "The Chogigah, which was strictly a peace-offering might be two-fold. The first Chogigah was offered on the 14th of Nisan, the day of the Paschal sacrifice, and formed afterwards part of the Paschal Supper. The second Chogigah was offered on the 15th Nisan, or the first day of the feast of unleavened bread. \* \* In reference to the first Chogigah, the *Mishnah* lays down the rule, that it was only to be offered if the Paschal day fell on a week-day, not on a Sabbath, and if the Paschal lamb alone would not have been sufficient to give a satisfying supper to the company which gathered around it."† The Paschal Supper itself was of a serious and solemn character; that of the Chogigah was of a much more joyous nature. Now the very circumstances attendant upon our Lord's Paschal Supper with his disciples, makes it possible and probable that some of the preparations necessary for the Chogigah of the 15th had been omitted, and nothing could hence be more natural than the supposition that Judas went forth to buy some things necessary for the festive offerings of the next day.

(c) The argument also assumes that on account of the festival character of that night no articles could have been purchased by Judas on the evening following the 14th of Nisan, and hence the supposition of the disciples makes it certain that this supper of John was at an earlier date, probably on the evening following Nisan 13th. But Edersheim effectually disposes of this argument. "Sufficient here to state that the provision and preparation of needful food, and indeed of all that was needful

\*Andrews, p. 470. See also Meyer on John, pp. 22, 38, 72.

†Temple, 186.



for the Feast, was allowed on the 15th Nisan. And this must have been specially necessary, when, as in this instance, the first festive day, or 15th Nisan, was to be followed by a Sabbath, on which no such work was permitted."\* Dr. Edersheim quotes the Mishnah in support of his position.

(d) On the whole, then, a fair interpretation of John 13 : 29 strongly favors the view that this was the Paschal Supper. Had this supper taken place on the evening following the 13th Nisan, a whole day before the celebration of the Passover, there certainly was no occasion for haste on the part of Judas in purchasing the necessary articles for that supper. He had all the next day before him on which to attend to this. Besides they must have been the less important articles, as the Paschal lamb had to be selected by the 10th Nisan. But if this supper occurred on the evening following the 14th, then haste was needful to purchase all that might yet be required for the festive offerings of the 15th. "In the Paschal night, when the great temple gates were opened at midnight to begin early preparations for the offering of the *Chogigah*, \* \* which was not voluntary but of due, and the remainder of which was afterwards eaten at a festive meal, such preparations would be quite natural. And equally so, that the poor, who gathered around the Temple, might then seek to obtain the help of the charitable."† Indeed it is unnatural to suppose that Judas would have gone out on the evening of the 13th to seek the poor towards midnight, and it is exceedingly natural to suppose that he would go out on such an errand on the evening of the 14th, for at that hour they would be gathered about the Temple.‡

(3) It is argued from John 18 : 28, "and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they might be defiled; but that they might eat the Passover," that the Jews had not yet eaten the Passover, and therefore the supper of John was not the true Passover meal. The question here turns upon the meaning of the clause "that they might eat the Passover." Does it refer to the festive offerings following the Paschal meal, or to the

\*II., p. 508.

†Edersheim, II., p. 508.

‡So Josephus, Steir, Andrews, Luthardt, Robinson, *et al.*

Paschal meal itself? Meyer boldly affirms the latter: "Since 'to eat the Passover' throughout the New Testament denotes nothing else than to eat the Paschal meal, \* \* it is thus clear that on the day, in the early part of which Jesus was brought to the procurator, *the paschal lamb had not yet been eaten*, but *was to be eaten*, and that consequently Jesus was crucified on the day *before the feast*."\* So Weiss,† Farrar,‡ Westcott.§ In reply it may be urged:

(a) That while the phrase "to eat the Passover" in the Synop-  
tists does usually refer to the Paschal meal, it cannot be shown  
that it always does so in John. Indeed his references to the  
Passover usually refer, as we have seen, to the whole festival, and  
if this be so, it certainly is allowable that "to eat the Passover"  
with him may mean to partake of other festive celebrations in  
connection with the Passover, as for example the *Chogigah*. Dr.  
Robinson admirably argues this point.|| Westcott claims that  
"nothing but a determination to adapt these words to a theory  
could suggest the idea that 'eating the Passover' applies to any-  
thing but the great Paschal meal."¶ Farrar claims that "there  
was nothing specifically Paschal about it" [the *Chogigah*].\*\*  
And Dr. Edersheim thus answers him, "Dr. Farrar should have  
paused before committing himself to such a statement. One of  
the most learned Jewish writers, Dr. Saalschütz, is not of this  
opinion. He writes as follows:

'The whole feast and *all its festive meals* were designated as  
the Passover. See Deut. 16 : 2, Compare 2 Chron. 30 : 24, and  
35 : 8, 9.' " And then he quotes from the Talmud, "What is  
the meaning of the term Passover? (Answer.) The peace-  
offerings of the Passover." "As a rule the *Chogigah* was al-  
ways brought on the 15th Nisan, and it required Levitical purity.  
Lastly, Dr. Farrar himself admits that the statement of St. John  
must not be too closely pressed, 'for that *some* of the Jews must  
have even gone into the judgment-hall without noticing the  
defilement is clear.' "†† "Here both the Old Testament and

\*On John, 486.

†III., 276.

‡II., 476.

§Intro., 337.

||Harmony, p. 191. ¶Intro., 337. \*\*II., p. 477, note. ††Temple, p. 346, f.

VOL. XXV. No. 2.

Jewish writings show, that the term *Pesach*, or 'Passover' was applied not only to the Paschal Lamb, but to all the Passover sacrifices, especially \* \* the *Chogigah*. No competent Jewish archaeologist would care to deny that *Pesach* may refer to the *Chogigah*, while the motive assigned to the Sanhedrists by St. John implies, that in this instance it *must* refer to this, and not to the Paschal Lamb.\* See also Andrews' full discussion.†

From the general usage of the term, therefore, and from St. John's almost habitual usage we conclude that this verse is not proof positive that the Jews had not yet eaten the Paschal Supper.

(b) As to the matter of defilement. The chief priests feared to enter the palace of Pilate, a Gentile, for fear of ceremonial uncleanness. The evidence, however, seems to be overwhelming that defilement contracted by entrance into the house of a heathen lasted only for a day. "A person who had so become Levitically unclean was technically called *Tebhul Tom*, 'bathed of the day.' "‡ The testimony on this point appears to me conclusive. The defilement would then cease with sunset and after the polluted person had bathed, and the Paschal meal could then be eaten. Entrance into Pilate's judgment-hall would have rendered these chief priests ceremonially unclean and debarred them from partaking of the *Chogigah* or festive offerings on that day. But it would not have prevented their eating the Paschal lamb in the evening after sunset. The argument from this verse is therefore inconclusive; it is rather a strong confirmation of the fact that they had eaten the Paschal Supper the night before, and did not wish to render themselves ceremonially unfit to participate in the glad services of Nisan 15th. If this had been the morning of the 14th Nisan, they could have gone into Pilate's palace and still have eaten the Paschal lamb in the evening. See also Andrews, p. 471.

(4) Another passage relied upon for proving that the supper of John was not the Paschal meal is John 19 : 14. "And it was the preparation of the Passover." It is claimed that the day thus designated was the day on the evening of which the Paschal

\*II., p. 568.

†p. 471.

‡Eidersheim, II., 567.

meal was eaten, and hence a day of preparation for the Passover. So Meyer,\* Weiss,† Westcott,‡ Farrar.§ If this is true then Christ was crucified on 14th Nisan. But is it true? The word *Parasceue*, or 'Preparation' occurs in Matt. 27 : 62, Mk. 15 : 42, Luke 23 : 54, John 19 : 14, 31, 42. All four evangelists agree in stating that Christ was crucified on a Preparation day. Mark and Luke agree in putting this day immediately preceding the Sabbath, and John before a Sabbath which he calls "a high day," 19 : 31. According to Mark and Luke, then, it was the Jewish Saturday, our Friday, and against this Matt. 27 : 62, John 19 : 31 and 42 cannot be urged. The issue lies with John 19 : 14.

Inasmuch as no work was allowed on a Sabbath a part of the day preceding was especially employed in preparing for the weekly Sabbath. Presently the whole day became known as the "Preparation," until this became really the name for the sixth day of the week. It was moreover the only day of the week that had a name, except the Sabbath.|| Westcott acknowledges this: "Friday was indeed *the* preparation for the weekly Sabbath, and as such it was natural that the name should be used for it so commonly that at last it became the proper name of the day."¶ "It appears, then, that among the Jews, Syrians, and Arabs the common word for *eve*, to which corresponds the Greek word for 'preparation,' meaning the preparation of the weekly Sabbath, became at an early date a current appellation for the sixth day of the week. That is, Friday was known as the *Preparation* or *Fore-Sabbath*; just as in German the usual name for Saturday is now *Sonnabend*, that is, 'eve of Sunday.'\*\*\* The weight of testimony seems to be strongly against interpreting this text as a preparation day for the Passover, though it is admitted that if this was the only passage giving us a note of time upon this important incident a natural inference might be that it was the day immediately preceding the Passover.†† But we hold that

\*John, 508.

†III., 276.

‡Introduct., 336.

§II., 476.

||This is recognized by the Revisers, John 19 : 14, 31 *et al.*, R. V.

¶Introduct., p. 335.

\*\*\*Robinson, Har., 192.

††Alford, Godet *in loc.* See also Schaff, Hist. Ch. Church I., p. 134.

the use of the term by the Synoptists and by John in the two other instances where the word occurs are decisive against any such interpretation, and therefore that no argument can legitimately be drawn from 19 : 14, that Christ was crucified on Nisan 14th. The whole question is very satisfactorily discussed by Robinson,\* and Andrews,† and Kendrick.‡

(5) Some stress is laid, by those who contend for the 14th as the day of the crucifixion, upon John 19 : 31, "for that Sabbath was a high day." It is claimed that this justifies the inference that the first day of the feast, or the 15th of Nisan, which was itself a feast Sabbath,§ fell upon the weekly Sabbath. For this reason it was called "great." If this is correct then Christ must have been crucified on the 14th, and the Preparation day would be a preparation both for the Passover and the Sabbath. But that point remains to be proved. Indeed Edersheim claims that this Sabbath was called "a high day" because "it was both a Sabbath and the second Paschal day, which was regarded as in every respect equally sacred with the first—nay, more so, since the so-called wave-sheaf was then offered to the Lord."|| Robinson is equally as decided.¶ Until it can be definitely and positively shown that the coincidence of the 15th Nisan with the Sabbath of Passover week was the only circumstance that justified the designation of that Sabbath as "a high day," we are forced to conclude that John 19 : 31 offers no data for the settlement of this question.

We have now examined about all the passages urged in proof of the fact that the supper of John was *not* the Paschal meal, and we have seen upon what a weak foundation they rest. They all are taken from St. John's gospel, and we humbly submit that a fair, natural and common-sense interpretation of all these passages, bearing in mind the character of John's gospel, the time of its composition, the changed circumstances at that time, confirms rather than antagonizes the Synoptic narratives. We cannot but conclude that the supper of John was identical

\*Harmony, 192. †p. 474.

‡Meyer on John, 498.

§Ex. 12 : 16.

||Edersheim, II., p. 613.

¶Harmony, p. 193.

with that of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and that St. John offers nothing in contradiction to their account that the crucifixion took place on Friday, Nisan 15th.

This view is strengthened by several additional considerations.

1. The release of a prisoner, according to the custom of the Roman procurators, "at the feast" (Matt., Mk., Luke,) "at the Passover," (John 18 : 39.) shows that the Paschal festival was then already in progress. "Hence the release of Barrabas, and with it the crucifixion of Jesus, could *not* have taken place (as Dr. Farrar supposes) on the 14th of Nisan, the morning of which could *not* have been designated as 'the feast,' and still less as the Passover.'"\*

2. By astronomical calculation, "which shows that in A. D. 30, the probable year of the crucifixion, the 15th Nisan actually fell on a Friday (Apr. 7), and this was the case only once more between the years A. D. 28 and 36, except perhaps also 33. Consequently Christ must have been crucified A. D. 30,"† and if so on Nisan 15th. These calculations are strongly relied upon by McClellan. Prof. Adams in McClellan's *Harmony* exults in the testimony of the very heavens to the harmony of the gospels.

3. The occurrences of the afternoon of the death of Jesus are more easily accounted for on Nisan 15th than they could be on Nisan 14th. Jesus died at about 3 p. m. and at that hour on the 14th every household would be busy preparing for the Passover, and the head of every household would be in waiting at the temple courts for the slaying of his Paschal lamb. It is therefore, as Dr. Schaff says, "difficult to explain that they [the chief priests], together with the people, should have remained about the cross till late in the afternoon of the 14th \* \* and that Joseph of Arimathea with the pious women, should have buried the body of Jesus and so have incurred defilement at that solemn hour."‡ And it is no valid objection to this view that Nisan 15th was a feast Sabbath, and therefore such acts as the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, the buying of linen, the entomb-

---

\*Edersheim, *Temple* 349, quoted from Wiesler.

†Schaff, *Christ*, Ch. I., p. 135.

‡Chr. Ch. I., p. 135.

ment of Jesus, Simon of Cyrene's coming out of the country (on the gratuitous assumption that he had been at work) would all have been unlawful and hence improbable. For a feast Sabbath was *not* as solemn as the weekly Sabbath and certain work was allowable on those days,\* certain purchases were permissible,† the Talmud permits attention to the dead and the meeting of the Sanhedrin on Sabbaths and feast days.‡ Besides the whole history shows these chief priests to have been a set of hypocritical religionists who would scruple at nothing to destroy Jesus of Nazareth.

We may leave the question then, fully satisfied with the evidence that Jesus was crucified on the 15th of Nisan, and that there is no discrepancy between the account of John and that of the Synoptists. The words of Dr. Robinson will commend themselves: "After repeated and calm consideration, there rests upon my own mind a clear conviction that there is nothing in the language of John, or in the attendant circumstances, which upon fair interpretation requires or permits us to believe that the beloved disciple either intended to correct, or has in fact corrected or contradicted, the explicit and unquestionable testimony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke."§

---

\*Lev. 23 : 7, 25, 35.

†Edersheim, Temple, 348

‡Tholuck on John 13 : 1.

§Harmony, 194.



## ARTICLE V.

## THE ORDER FOR THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

BY GEORGE U. WENNER, D. D.

The subject of this article has a practical interest for the ministers and churches of the General Synod. Twenty years ago an Order for the Baptism of Infants was presented to the Synod by the committee appointed to prepare liturgical forms, but in the face of adverse criticism it was finally rejected. The General Synod is without a regularly approved form for this most important act of initiation into the Christian Church. At the last meeting of the General Synod, the duty of preparing forms for ministerial acts was assigned to the committee on the Common Service. In view of a report from them on this subject, and for the purpose of calling attention to the questions involved in it, this study is presented to the readers of the *QUARTERLY*.

The earliest candidates for baptism were of course adults. The ceremonies were simple. But in the course of time, as the number of candidates from among the heathen increased, it was felt to be necessary to prepare them more carefully for the step they were about to take. The Lord's command to make disciples included the duty of teaching as well as that of baptizing. The course of instruction sometimes occupied two years. In the catechisations of Cyrill of Jerusalem and of Augustine, that have come down to us from the middle of the fourth century, we have models of Christian instruction and training.

But not only by means of the word did they seek to instruct the candidates, outward ceremonies and acts were also employed to convey spiritual teaching. Some of these were taken from the example of the Lord. Others suggested themselves, or may have been borrowed from heathen customs. The object of these ceremonies was to impress upon the candidate the importance of the step he was about to take, and to awaken in him the earn-

est prayer to be delivered from the power of darkness by which he had hitherto been held, and to obtain in reality the new birth which was offered to him in baptism.

In the fourth and fifth centuries, we find that the candidates for baptism were divided into three distinct classes, into each of which they were admitted by certain liturgical forms. First they were made Christians, *χριστιανούς ποιεῖν*, then Catechumens, *κατηχουμένους ποιεῖν*, then Competents or Elect, from which class they were finally admitted into the company of the Fideles. In each of these stages there were numerous exorcisms, symbolic acts, through which the necessity of deliverance from the powers of darkness was impressed upon the candidate. During the Passion season, immediately preceding the Easter baptism, there were frequent examinations or scrutinies. At one stage the text of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer was confided to them. It was a true pedagogical impulse, as well as ecclesiastical, that led the early church to withhold from the candidate the succinct statement of belief until he had thoroughly learned its meaning in the course of catechetical instruction. Then came the formal *redditio*, or repetition of the Christian faith, in which they were examined as to their knowledge, and their purpose to renounce the devil and all his works. Each class had certain duties and privileges, and as the candidates were admitted into the higher classes, they obtained increasing privileges in connection with the church service.

It would be interesting to study these various forms of *χριστιανούς ποιεῖν* and *κατηχουμένους ποιεῖν*, and to show their relation to the subsequent development of the baptismal service, but it would take a volume to do so and it is not necessary for our purpose.

In the course of time infant baptism became the rule and adult baptism became the exception. The forms for adult baptism were transferred to the baptism of infants, even though some of the symbolic acts, such as the exorcisms, had no significance in the new relation in which they were used. The scrutinies also, and the forms arising from a change of place where the liturgical acts were performed, some of them outside

the church, some of them at the entrance, and some of them at the baptistery itself, were nevertheless largely retained. Other changes in the life and condition of the church brought about the fusion into one form of what had formerly been separate liturgical acts.

As in some geological stratum one may read the story of the animal life of past ages, so we may distinctly read in the language of the old services of baptism the history of conditions and transitions that took place centuries before.

In the Roman form for the baptism of adults we may clearly trace the lines that mark the *Christianum facere*, the *Catechumenum facere*, the end of the first, sixth and seventh scrutinies and the beginning of baptism proper. Thus services that were formerly held at different times are here brought together into one act.

As in geology, so in liturgies, parts have been perpetuated long after the occasion for their use has passed away. In the latest English form for infant baptism published by one of the general bodies of the Lutheran church, one may find in the middle of the service such a sentence as this: "The Lord preserve thy coming in and thy going out, from this time forth even for evermore." This means that ages ago the catechumen had successfully passed the first six examinations and was now permitted on the Saturday before Easter to enter the church itself for the first time as a Competent. And upon his entering the church the minister greeted him with the *votum Davidicum*, Psalm 121 : 8. This is but one illustration of the fact that expressions were retained in the liturgical forms which had no longer any significance in the new order of things. It was proper to build upon the old foundation, but care should also have been taken to reconstruct in accordance with the needs of the later times. In Luther's first translation of the baptismal service, 1523, he thus criticises the form: "As yet I have no special changes to make, although I could wish it had been better prepared, for it has had unindustrious masters."

The Reformation introduces us to a most productive period

in the development of the baptismal service. Luther's first *Taufbuechlein* of 1523 attempted little more than a translation of the ancient order. Recent investigations however have shown that the forms consulted by him were not those in Roman use, but certain independent ones that were in force in various German dioceses. He retains the traditional forms and ceremonies. But in it he made one immortal contribution to the service, the famous prayer relating to the "waters of the flood" and "Jordan and all waters." So completely does it bear the marks of antiquity that the most careful efforts have been made by scholars to discover the mine from which this gem was taken. It went over into the English liturgy, and is to this day universally used by Anglican churches. Blunt, in his *Annotated Book of Common Prayer* says of it: "This prayer is not derived from the old office of the English church, but is probably of great antiquity. Luther translated it into German from the ancient Latin [!] in 1523 and it appears again in his 'Baptismal Book' of 1524 [?]" In point of fact there is no evidence that it is not a prayer of Luther's own composition.

In 1526 Luther published a revised form which differs from the earlier one mainly in the omission of some of the symbolic acts which had been in use in the ancient services. The various forms which subsequently came into use in the Lutheran Church are divided by Hoefling into three classes. The first class includes Luther's first book and the few that were constructed along its lines. The second includes Luther's second book and a majestic array of services that followed its plan, with such additions as the fulness of the church's new life seemed to require. The third consists of an important class of services starting with Schwaebisch-Hall, Brenz's, in 1543, and found mainly in South Germany. They assumed an independent, critical relation to the subject and were less influenced by the requirements of tradition.

All of these classes agree in that they object to the use of the Latin, to the consecration of the material substances in the symbolic acts, and to the multiplication of the symbolic acts themselves which had grown up in the catechumenate, and which

had nothing to do with the act of baptism. On the other hand many of them defended the use of "human traditions" over against ultraprotestants who denied entirely the right of the Church to create new forms.

Hoeffling's analysis shows that the first and second classes, in their admonitions and prayers, were pervaded by this common thought, that the Church here presents an infant, a child of sin and wrath and earnestly prays for help and grace in baptism that it may become a child of God.

The third class largely ignores this thought, and represents the present congregation as using the divine ordinance in the name of the Lord and his Church. It also does away entirely with the symbolic acts which had been inherited from the catechuminate, such as exsufflation, signation and exorcism.

The question as to the use or the omission of these symbolic acts, especially that of exorcism, has been a fruitful source of theological litigation. But fortunately, there has never been a serious doctrinal difference among Lutherans on the subject. It is universally conceded that they belong to the *ἀδίαφορα*. Only the Reformed position, that they had no right to exist, was stoutly contested. Exorcism is not used now in any of the modern Lutheran liturgies, not even by Loehe, although he says of it that, properly understood, it belongs to the fairest and most majestic products of the liturgic field.

A number of questions, practical as well as doctrinal, remain to be considered, but their consideration must be deferred. Should the words of institution be used in connection with this sacrament as uniformly as in the case of the other? What is the relation of the gospel of the little children, Mark 10th, to the order? Is renunciation of the devil an essential part of the order? What is the relation of the sponsors to the service? Should the Creed be tradited or reddited? Should the minister say Dost thou believe? Or should he say We believe, &c.? What should be the character of the addresses or admonitions, and to whom should they be directed? These and other questions may perhaps stimulate the readers of the *QUARTERLY* to a further study of this interesting subject.

## ARTICLE VI.

## THREE THIRDS OF A MAN AND HIS EDUCATION.

BY HENRY C. HAITHCOX, D. D.

There are three things man cannot get away from—himself, the world, and God. And these three are three realities. Man is a reality between two realities. He is conscious of both. He bears the image of both. He sustains a vital relation to both. His education has to do with both, and especially with him and his poise between the two. Sometimes one of these is in the ascendancy and then the other. At one time the trend of thought is Godward, at another time it is worldward, and then at yet another time it is manward. When Jehovah said to man, "Subdue the earth," thought ran earthward. When the voice said, "Worship God," then thought went Godward. When Wisdom said, Take heed unto thyself, thought flowed manward. God looks to man. The earth points to man. What is man? That is a question more than three thousand years old, and yet it is ever new. It is an interrogation point of fire—a burning question. Out on farm and field the answer is, Man is monarch over earth and beast. In the office he is known by name and by number. In the shop he is a third somewhat between two machines—not quite a machine yet a connecting link between two machines. Which is the greater, the man or the machine, does not readily appear in the running and rush and clatter for results. Not until you see the man who stands behind that machinery from whose head flashed the thoughts that run and rush and clatter through that iron and steel, do you say, Man is a maker, thinking, talking, acting like God. Even in the school-room he is sometimes confounded with a figure from the multiplication table and quite lost behind it, as if he were only a thing. Is man only a figure? And a back number at that? No; he is a figurer, in the present tense with future in promise. He is a person forming figures, arranging them so

they tell values, uses, places, relations, results. He makes figures tell the truth and he makes figures lie too—just like his words. He is a person, turning this way and that way, saying this or saying that, telling the truth and telling the lie, loving the world and grumbling about it, blessing God and cursing him—what shall we do with him—with this self-willed, autocratic, many-sided, personal being, we call man? Educate him? Yes, that is it precisely. Educate him, not a part of him, but him in his completeness. That is what we mean by three-thirds of a man and his education.

As a person man is a unit, one agent with various faculties and capacities, expressing himself through words and acts, yet concealing himself behind the little pronouns, I, thou, he, she, and sometimes it.

He is also spoken of as a dual being, composed of soul and body, spirit and matter, the point where two worlds begin.

He is said also to be a trinity of body, soul, and spirit, a *sarx*, a *pseuche*, and a *pneuma*, all in one person.

Then a little further analysis makes him quadruple, and he is spoken of as physical, intellectual, moral and religious, a four-fold being needing a four-fold education in order to be a well rounded man.

And yet onward goes the analysis and the *physical* man appears as four-fold. With every one of his 200 bones in its place he is a better mechanical structure than any mechanic on earth could make, though he be only a skeleton man.

Then hiding away this death-like frame work are 500 muscles each having its special use, and so arranged, and so elastic, as no master inventor on terra firma could devise—voluntary and involuntary muscles, contractive and relaxive, with tendons gripping the bones with a force of a hundred pounds to the square inch, man begins to appear in his strength. Then there are 18 pounds of liquid life running through these 500 muscles and 200 bones, feeding them, and giving them color and strength. Thus out from a pumping heart to finger and toe tip flows the life blood; back from finger and toe tip goes the current, circulating freely, making man red with life, a creature of perpetual



motion, always active, never resting, until the angel of death touches the heart and then arteries and veins, muscles and bones collapse, and they lie in ruins.

But the finest part of this physical man we have not yet seen. The nearer we approach the personal man, the thinking, reasoning man, the finer the material, the more intricate the way, and the more wonderful the display of genius and power. Running through the bones, muscles, arteries, veins, are thousands of nerves, touching every needle point of surface and all centering where the person sits enthroned, receiving messages from the world and sending forth messages to the world and to the God over the world. No system of telegraphy conceived by man, nor burglar alarm for office, bank or home, can compare with the electric system of God in every man's body for the personal man who lives within.

Hitherto we have been in the outer courts of Man-soul. Education has to do with these, but chiefly with man in the holiest of all. Beyond where bones articulate, muscles grip, heart pumps away in where crimson fades into white and where nerves concenter, there stands the man whom we want to educate. He is the man whose nerves are thoughts, whose muscles are morals, and whose backbone is eternal purpose. He thinks, feels, wills. His understanding is logical, his reason is comprehending. His behests are for the right, his warnings against the wrong, his action like a god. And for reason. Light from God falls on his head. Breath from God quivers on his lips. He feels the presence of God deep in his soul, he is in touch with the world, he knows himself. There he is a self-conscious, world-conscious, God-conscious, man. In him are the data of the final philosophy, of the true religion, and the perfect education. Man, a personal spirit in three-fold consciousness, is the problem of the ages. Solve this problem, harmonize these three factors in one perfect man and you solve the problem. This is the work of education, to harmonize, develop, perfect, these three in one.

I. *First, man is conscious of himself.* He says, *I and me* with emphasis. He is conscious of himself as distinct from every

other. He says I, thou, he, she, it. There stand those pronouns. Knock them down if you will. They rise again before you can draw your breath to strike again. They are as immortal as self-conscious man. Better let them stand. They are effects, exponents, proofs of something real—what? A self-conscious personal spirit we call man.

Now that is one-third of the man whom we are talking about and trying to educate. To educate this one-third means anatomy, physiology, hygiene; it means mental and moral science—intellect, sensibilities and will; it means anthropology, historic, scientific, philosophic. To educate well this third of man, this self-conscious third, is no small matter. It means right thought, right relation between soul and body—what they are and how they should dwell together and bless each other.

II. *Then there is a second third* which most people regard very important, viz., the world consciousness. We love this rock laid and stone built world. It gives us food, raiment, and a home for three score years and ten. It furnishes us with play grounds, flower gardens, singing birds, and fields for the display of our powers. Its landscape is beautified with rivers and lakes, and becomes sublime in sea and mountain. Her rock, iron, silver, gold; her sun, moon, stars, of all which we are conscious, and want, long to know, to love, to use and to enjoy. To educate well this world consciousness means geography, geology, mineralogy, botany, entomology, ornithology, zoology, astronomy—all the natural sciences and physics and chemistry, and no small part of man's education is this. It means a knowledge of all the big world about us of which men talk so much, and for which men have fought so much to get and to keep. How to possess the world, how to use it, how to be at home in it, is one-third of the goal of man's education.

III. *Then there is the third third of man that needs educating—* HIS GOD-CONSCIOUS THIRD. His words and his acts tell us that he is conscious of himself. His words and his acts tell us that he is conscious of the world. His words and his acts tell us that he is conscious of God. Take away all those words that have come out of man's consciousness expressive of a supreme ruler

and you rob his language of much of its wealth. Language from man's soul concerning God means as much as language from his soul concerning the world. Foolish is he who denies the reality of either. Words, words, words, man's language is not words and nothing more. Words stand for thoughts, feelings, purposes, acts, places, persons and things. Even those words that describe the fictitious, and the ideal presuppose the true and the real. Language concerning God means as much as language concerning man or the world.

Then there are altars, tabernacles, synagogues, temples, churches, all over the earth and from time immemorial. Whence came they? Out of man's deep consciousness of the mighty God over all. From self come thoughts, words, acts that mean a real self. From the world come thoughts, words, acts that mean a real world. From God come thoughts, words, acts that mean a real God. Man, World, God. Three mighty realities. Self-conscious man stands and will not down. The world exists and will not away. God is and will not vanish. These three mighty, relentless realities stand in man's consciousness co-eternal with man's waking into conscious manhood. If he open his eyes they stand there. If he shut his eyes they stand there. If he try to explain them away they stand there. What shall he do about it? In the midst of two man consciously stands. He cannot hie himself away from such environment. Wherever he goes the world is on one side and God on the other. What shall he do about it? Acknowledge all and shape thought, word, conduct accordingly. How is that? So that self, the world, and God shall stand in right relations. What are right relations? This is the work of our schools to point out and help bring about.

It has been said, and few doubt it, that we are in troublous times. Why? There is a cause. What is it? It is educational and two-fold—selfish worldliness. Too many schools have been putting the emphasis on self and the world so long that man lifts himself up as lord and then does anything to get the world. Man is selfish, ambitious, proud, covetous. He wants the world. He drops in gold and makes it god. He

chooses silver rather than a good name. His education is naturalistic, worldly, selfish. So with hundreds of thousands trying to swallow one another to get a little more of the world that they may by form of right call their own, it is no wonder that labor and capital, man and man, and combine and combine, are having a hard time of it.

Thought is wrong. The spirit of man is wrong. The education is wrong. There is too much, relatively too much, education of the self and of the world-consciousness. Only two-thirds of a true education. The great question in too many of our schools begins and ends with, How get on in the world? Ah, but did it stop there it would be better. But it is the question in the home, too. Schools are selected that promise short cuts to big money; that offer most world knowledge; that promise position. Men and boys talk too much about how to get money, not how to *earn* it, and much less about how to build up a good character, forgetting that a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor rather than silver and gold. Such is a result of educating man too liberally on his earth side. It leaves self and the world in conflict, and man a one-sided monster, defective in morals, and in religion a hypocrite or a nondescript. How change this current? How balance up man? Let this two-thirds of a man go on reproducing himself, striving, contending, fighting until he monstrosly destroys himself? Even sin is self-destructive. No, not that way. The spirit of God in man, making for righteousness, says no. Then how? This way:

1. Teach our boys and girls to know themselves, and to be true to themselves. But do not stop there. To know only thyself is to know little and not that little well. To know thyself well is to know more than thyself. It is to know thy better self and what is thy place and thy relations. To make self knowledge preëminent is to become selfish, high minded, autocratic, and come into the condemnation of the devil. Satan himself is the protege of all such.

2. Then the next step is to learn to know the world. But do

not stop here. Even though thy knowledge of self and of the world be great, yet thou art then only two-thirds educated. Put the world into the hand of a selfish heart, gold and greed together, and you have a Judas ever. Schools that teach man chiefly his own importance and how to get the world, send forth Judases from their walls. Where nothing broader than geography, nothing deeper than geology, nothing higher than astronomy, nothing greater than anthropology, is taught, men grow into monsters of frightful mien who become world wreckers.

The education needed is that which puts emphasis on man's relation to God as well as to the world—that makes man godly and then the world will swing into right relation. God is over all blessed for evermore. Neither hath he left himself without witness in the consciousness of man. He looms up there with the world to be as real to man as the world can be, and to be more mighty for man's weal. Right character comes by keeping man intelligently and affectionately conscious of God, seeking to think his thought and speak it out in word and life. Then man is reverent but not superstitious. Then he is pleased with himself but not selfish. Then he loves the world but he is not worldly. Then he uses the world and abuses it not. He stands in the sanctity of God's idea for him. He is three-thirds of a man, every whit. He is God's man with God's education for him. Save Christ on this side of heaven there is nothing grander than such a man. Such a man it is the work of the Christian college to make.

Do you ask now why it is the peculiar function of the Christian college to make such men? Because a Christian college is God's school to make such men. Christ is God's setting forth of the perfect man—God's full, perfect, final expression of himself for humanity and the world. Christ is the Word of God with all the fullness of God for all men. In Christ are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. He is God's explanation of the world, whence and how and why it is. He is God's reconciliation of the world and of man to himself. He is God's thought, love, purpose, victorious in a restored harmony between God and man and the world. In Christ God-consciousness

over-masters, self-bows to God in love, the world submits, and man is glorified and the world transfigured. That is why a Christian college is God's school for man. It is founded in Christian faith for the teaching of that faith and life. God-consciousness of a Christian type is enthroned there. God's thought, love, idea, life in Christ, are taught there. The man, the whole man, the personal man, as he knows himself before God and facing the world, is educated there. Yes, the Christian college is God's school for God's man.

Russia's Tolstoi says that humanity has three stages of development: the barbarous, the age of the savage; the social, the age of Cæsar; the Christian, the age of Christ.

Another has said, "There are three steps in the Santa Scala which the Race is painfully and slowly ascending: Barbarism, where man cultivates the body, the age of Homer; Civilization, where men cultivate the intellect, the age of Socrates; holiness, where men cultivate the soul, the age of Jesus."

And Germany's Rosencranz says, "Not philosophy, but Jesus of Nazareth, freed the world from all selfishness and all bondage."

We have now come to that period of the Christian age when our horizon is enlarged. We see what was good in the age of Homer and utilize it without becoming barbarians; we see what was good in the age of Socrates and utilize it without becoming too intellectual; and yet more than civilized, even more than humanized, veritable Christians. We are beginning to see as never before that Christianity is the religion of humanity, and that a Christian education is all comprehensive and the only education that will measure up to God's idea for man. Christ is God's man for every nation, and God's school for all is the school whose chief corner-stone is Christ, whose capstone is Christ, whose vivifying spirit, teaching principle, and presiding genius, is Jesus of Nazareth, Son of God and Son of Man. Such a school saves men from barbarism, makes more than civilized, teaches more than naturalism and humanism, teaches the fullness of divine truth, develops the fullness of the divine life, and harmonizes the world and man with the Father Almighty,

Maker of heaven and earth. Christ is the heart of God in ideal and true manhood. He is the wisdom of God for all true education. He is God's center of gravity for humanity. Not until our educational forces are pivoted on him will they come into balance, and God's own three-thirds of man be symmetrically, harmoniously, truly, perfectly, educated, and all things become new.

I am glad that Lutheran theology and Lutheran education are Christo-centric. So are the prophets and the apostles. So is the Holy Ghost in his teaching. And all this means that God's agencies for the regeneration of the world, for the harmonizing of all with himself, are Christo-centric. Our education, to be in harmony with the divine thought, plan, purpose—to have the uplift of God in it—must center in Christ.

It has been said that all our schools are Christian, even our common schools' and State colleges. As compared with the schools of China, Asia, and India, where the schools are Confucian, Mohammedan, and Buddhistic, they may be said to be Christian. The dominant religion of the country is Christian. Therefore the schools of the country are Christian. But the country opens its door as wide to Judaism and Confucianism, and Mohammedanism, and Buddhism, as to Christianity. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." One religion is as free as another. And so our school is a religious nondescript. All this, it may be, because of the sufferance of Christianity in a government of the people, by the people, for the people. But our State school is not a positively, clear cut, Christian school. It may be better than heathen, better than purely naturalistic or humanistic, but it is not up to the standard of a Christian school required by the Church of Jesus, the Christ. It lacks the masterfulness of the Christian idea, and in the degree that it lacks in this, just so much it comes short of God's best school for God's best man. The Christian Church cannot rest content, cannot cease effort, until she has the best.

This is an age of combines. Individual competition is fading away and being lost in a pooling of interests. This spirit of the



times is affecting our educational forces. Even here it is in the air, if not yet articulated; so we must do great things or nothing. Let us cluster our educational forces about a great Cæsar who has plenty of money and mighty equipment. Great is the University of Cæsar. Build your ecclesiastical dormitories around about. Have one educational omnibus for all the State and for all the churches of the State. All aboard!—for where? Echo answers, "For where?" Great big schools is the demand of the *zeitgeist*. But hark! A voice. It is the voice of Dr. J. Stanley Hall. Hear it: "Our institutions are sometimes too large for either the best moral or intellectual ends."\* Hark again! Another voice. It is the voice of one who taught in Canada, in the United States and in Europe: "A large school is nearly always a hot house of mediocrity in scholarship and Philistinism in morals."†

The big school of Cæsar is predominantly naturalistic and humanistic. The world-consciousness and self-consciousness are fed more than the God-consciousness. Such is the kind of meat doth this our great Cæsar eat. Unbalanced thinking means unbalanced desires and unbalanced character. However limited in its means, however cramped in its teaching force, it is the little church college, pivoted on Christ, which gives poise to thought and balance to character—God's school for God's man.

I believe in creation. I also believe in development. There is a mighty struggle for life. Life's dynamic is egoistic. This egoistic force can never wholly cease. Self-preservation demands it. This is the human phase of life's struggle. It is the natural. First the natural and then the spiritual. First the egoistic and then the altruistic. Spencer, in his *Data of Ethics*, talks about them. Others have written about them. And now comes Dr. Drummond, and says, there is spiritual law in the natural world as well as natural law in the spiritual world. And this spiritual law shows itself in the altruistic dynamic which is the rising power making for righteousness among men, balancing selfism with otherism. Altruism, the love of another, is as

---

\* *The Forum*, April, 1894, p. 158.

† Thos. Davidson, *The Forum*, July, 1894, p. 577.

necessary to the welfare of society, as egoism or self-love. To harmonize these in the personal man rather, to develop these in harmony in personal character, is the work of the school. But that school that is naturalistic and humanistic in its teaching enthrones egoism, and leaves man selfish. To correct this we need to pivot and balance ourselves on him who came not to do his own will, but loved us, and gave himself for us. In him altruism was in the mastery harmonizing egoism with it, showing us the man without sin, the perfect man. That school pivoted on him, balanced on him, is the school of highest, truest, divinest development—God's school for God's three-thirds of a man.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### HELPFUL CO-OPERATION.

BY REV. JOHN E. BUSHNELL, A. M.

Just before the United Synod was formed in 1886, the closer and more general union of our English-speaking Synods was urged in the QUARTERLY. The *Observer*, *Evangelist*, *Lutheran*, *Workman*, *Our Church Paper* and the *Visitor* have published also the most encouraging promises for union in love and labor. The union of the Scandinavians effected at Minneapolis, in June 13, 1890, was in keeping with this general demand for closer fellowship. The events generally for the past decade show a growing desire for working fellowship along helpful lines. There seems to be, however, little disposition to force this desired union by a destruction of existing organizations. The tendency is rather in the direction of a more secure establishment so as to "strengthen the things which remain." We are commanded to be watchful ever for the sake of that which seems "ready to die." We must work together in harmony and love despite synodical and other differences, which are a burden to us in the work.

When the General Synod was organized at Hagerstown, Oct. 24, 1820, many hoped the whole Lutheran Church in America could be united in this one representative body, as the churches

had been united in the historic ministerium of Pennsylvania, organized in 1748, the first and for many years the only Lutheran Synod in this country.

The declared object of the General Synod was to unite the various district Synods, which had been organized in the several States, and thus promote the harmony, efficiency and success of the churches generally. All of the district bodies except the recently formed Synod of Ohio were so united and for forty years the great majority of the new Synods formed were regularly united in the one General Synod. The steady growth of the churches from only 850 in 1820 to 10,000 for 1895, continued in the happy fellowship of the one general body, until 1862 when the Southern Synods were not represented because of the conditions of the fratricidal war. While a new general body has been organized in the South, the spirit of working fellowship is, perhaps, more fully realized in consequence of this fact, since here General Synod and General Council men work together, meet and part, in the best of fellowship, as an object lesson.

The following table affords a practical view of the growth in the General Synod, during the past decades :

|        |  |   |   |   |    |
|--------|--|---|---|---|----|
| 1820.  | Synods represented at Hagerstown,        | . | . | . | 4  |
| 1829.  | Synods represented at Hagerstown,        | . | . | . | 3  |
| 1839.* | Synods represented at Chambersburg, Pa., | . | . | . | 7  |
| 1850.  | Synods represented at Charleston, S. C., | . | . | . | 16 |
| 1859.  | Synods represented at Pittsburg,         | . | . | . | 26 |
| 1869.  | Synods represented at Washington,        | . | . | . | 22 |
| 1879.  | Synods represented at Wooster, O.,       | . | . | . | 23 |
| 1889.  | Synods represented at Allegheny, Pa.,    | . | . | . | 23 |
| 1893.  | Synods represented at Canton, O.,        | . | . | . | 26 |

The decrease from 26 to 22 synods, involved also the deductions made when the General Council was formed in 1866. It is thus seen that the high water mark of synodical representation reached in 1859 was not reached again until the 36th convention at Canton in 1893, at which time significant "Overtures, for Practical Co-operation, to all Lutheran Bodies in America" were introduced by the influential delegate of the new California

---

\*Dr. Morris was Secretary in 1839.

Synod. The animus of these "Overtures" is fairly indicated in the following resolutions :

"3rd. For the furtherance of this object, a committee of five be appointed at this convention, to represent the General Synod in such possible conference, and that said committee be and is hereby authorized to confer with other said bodies in regard to the objects herein named ; provided, always, and it is herein expressly declared, that said committee shall have no power or authority whatever to bind the General Synod by any action it may take in conjunction with any other committee or committees ; and that it is invested with only conferential authority and shall report back to the next General Synod the results of its efforts.

"4th. That in the name of our beloved Church, and in the greater name of our Lord and Master, and appealing to the Searcher of all hearts for the integrity of our motives, we respectfully ask and hope for the kindest consideration of our Lutheran brethren, of this our fraternal overture and pray for the richest blessing of Almighty God upon it."

While the General Synod, with its marked increase of working power, in clerical and lay membership and prosperous institutions, represents only the same number of district Synods it had in 1859, the Lutheran Church as a whole in this country has now fifty-nine District Synods, thirty-five sub-Synods and four General Bodies with a communicant membership which is six-fold greater than what it was forty years ago.

As the 37th Biennial Convention meets at Hagerstown in the old St. John's Church where it was organized seventy-five years ago, where the pastor in charge has labored with good success for fully twenty-five years, while other strong congregations have grown up in the same place to illustrate the like increase at large, it is timely to expect some good results, when the committee on "Overtures" makes its report. In fact, the prayer of our blessed Saviour, which is the expression of every Lutheran heart, has already been wonderfully answered at home and abroad, both among us and in the whole Christian world, despite all existing differences and conflicting interests. It is

true, as Prof. Pieper has said so frankly in speaking\* of *Church Union*, that "all *Christians* are already *one* in Christ. Christ's promise that 'there shall be one fold and one Shepherd,' (John 10 : 16), has been in the course of fulfilment ever since the times of the apostles, whenever a soul by true conversion was added to the communion of believers. All Christians actually agree on the main articles of Christian religion, namely, on the article, that they have forgiveness of their sins through faith in Christ alone, and not by their own works, although many of them are in external connection with heterodox churches, and, by infirmity, err in some parts of doctrine. For it is this faith that makes a man a Christian and unites him with the spiritual body of Christ."

"Nevertheless," he adds, "it is a deplorable state of things, that there are external communities differing in doctrine. Sects, as stated before, do not exist according to God's will and good pleasure, but only by God's forbearance. All Christians, therefore, should be desirous of a reunion, and earnestly labor for the same." Being associated in daily fellowship with the German Lutherans represented by Prof. Pieper, and knowing something about their substantial work, we shall labor for this most helpful fellowship, that we "may be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," (1 Cor. 1 : 10.)

This is practically the way we do with others in our interdenominational fellowship. To agree on main points does not mean that we agree on all points. When we meet Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists in any practical fellowship, there is no proposal to disorganize their institutions, or even to repudiate their teaching where the differences are well understood. We meet simply upon the basis of the truth we may hold in common, and may never betray the trust of either congregational or synodical obligations. The truth as we understand it is always our rule for faith and practice, and we can never surrender at this point. Organic unity must follow only the unity of the spirit, in faith and love as it is in the

---

\*"Distinctive Doctrines and Usages," p. 136.

one Lord Jesus Christ who is "head over all things to the Church." (Eph. 1 : 22).

The Constitution of the General Synod as it was organized 75 years ago in Hagerstown was signed by delegates Schmucker, Geissenhainer, Muhlenberg, Lochman, Endress, Kunkel, Hensel and Stichter of Pennsylvania; Schaeffer and Mayer of New York, Schmucker and Shober, of North Carolina, and Schaeffer, Kurtz, and Schryock of Maryland, who represented also the churches in Virginia, since this field was embraced in the Maryland Synod until 1830, when the Virginia Synod was organized. These fathers in the faith, Lochman, Kurtz, Schaeffer, and Shober with others suggest hallowed memories, and their labors of love in the face of a flood-tide of fanaticism, should never be forgotten.

While the fratricidal war made the first break in the organic union of the 26 synods represented in 1859, the spirit of brotherly love which brooded over the convention at Charleston, S. C., in 1850, and at Winchester, Virginia, in 1853 was alive in the hearts of our Christian people on both sides of the bloody line. The majority of those who led the contending forces for Church and State in these painful issues for separation are now in the perfect union of that peace and love which we seek to-day, and over the grave of that buried past we plant the flowers of a new desire for loving fellowship. On the very eve of the civil war, our pastors stood upon the border-line and at the frontier preaching the Gospel of "peace, good-will toward men." Let me reproduce a quotation from the unpublished history by Dr. Eichelberger, prepared for the press in 1859. His ministry at Winchester, and his work as theological teacher in South Carolina warrant the conclusion that he fairly represented the whole Southern Church. He says, speaking for the organic union of the whole Church in the one General Synod: "The hope is as already stated, that this union may still be effected and that all of our synods, in the spirit of Christian love and fellowship, laying aside all minor differences and governed only by what is believed to be essential and fundamental in religion, may still come to approve and sanction it. In the meantime, let us all, as Chris-

tian brethren, learn to bear in meekness our supposed differences, till permitted to see eye to eye in regard to them and still pray and labor on in the spirit of Christ, and according to the grace given us, in promoting the cause of truth and holiness and in building up the Redeemer's kingdom in the world." (*Hist. of Lutheran Ch.*)

May we soon see some sort of helpful co-operation realized so that the undivided strength of the Lutheran Church in America may be used to the very best advancement of all concerned. The young people of the Church are ripe for such helpful co-operation. As one practical result of this working fellowship our Publication Society has been able to issue, in response to the suggestion of a lay-member, that valuable book in which eminent writers represent the "Distinctive Doctrines and Usages" of six general bodies," with the prayer that it "may build us all up into a more blessed fellowship." The volumes of "Practical Helps" have been issued, and it is evident even to other denominations that while the "authors are drawn from nearly all the divisions of the Church, there is harmony and agreement in the teachings of the simple but profound faith so characteristic of true Lutheranism."

Thus the press may lead the pulpit. Whether we see it or not, the day is coming when our publications, rich with the pure Gospel of Christ, shall go into all homes by the practical co-operation of those who are loyal and influential representatives of our separate synods. The pastors and people generally appreciate our common bond of fellowship in the one true Scriptural faith. In this working fellowship, since America is and always will be the home of an English-speaking nation, our English Lutheran literature will naturally lead the way for a wider and universal circulation. English periodicals and books must eventually reach regularly ten thousand Lutheran congregations, and it is not too much to hope that some co-operative plan may provide acceptable Lutheran literature, for a million Lutheran homes where we shall speak the same thing in the same English tongue and with essentially the same scriptural purpose. This kingdom indeed comes without our prayers.



From the Atlantic to the Pacific our heavenly Father gives us the same grace by which we believe his holy word. This word is being taught regularly to-day in the bounds of our General Synod, the United Synod, and also, to our personal knowledge, in Sunday-schools representing the General Council where the literature issued by our Publication Society is used, in common because it serves the purpose to advantage. The same can be said for our church papers. No synodical lines can limit the proper power of the press in this free land. It is not in vain, therefore, that the Constitution of our General Synod, in the Minutes and in the Book of Worship, keeps before all eyes the binding charge (Art. IV., § 7) that we are to be, "sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment \* \* in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom may not pass by neglected and unavailing."

Not wishing to be personal and yet to enforce this sentiment for helpful co-operation, let me say in conclusion that like views were advanced as pastor of the church where the United Synod was organized, and it is also suggestive that the very man who was the first President of this United Synod is now pastor of the historic Zion Church at Harrisburg, while the Vice-president who succeeded Dr. Gilbert, is pastor of a General Council congregation. In full harmony with fellow-pastors the sentiment for organic union has been advocated as a member of synod in Virginia and South Carolina, and also as a delegate to the general conventions in Wilmington and Savannah. There is no desire to take advantage of present synodical connections, for we can look across the continent as a loyal representative of this new synod and say to the beloved brethren everywhere, "We are all one in Christ." Here we welcome into one congregational fellowship true Lutherans from any synod and of every land. Let us labor together with one heart and mind for the upbuilding of our Redeemer's kingdom, giving our best love to our own household of faith upon the honorable terms of faithfulness to every scriptural mark of our ecclesiastical identity so

as to promote the peace and prosperity of the work we officially represent.

Working fellowship with our own people never takes any more grace than we need to cherish in working with other Christians; and despite all known barriers Lutheran fellowship that is liberal enough to embrace our united church will secure us rich returns for the missionary, educational and publishing enterprises of all alike.

We should "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called" as Lutheran Christians, "with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. 4 : 1-3).

In this spirit we are commissioned to teach all nations in the name of our common Lord who is with us alway even unto the end.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE KANSAS CONFERENCE OF THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD.

BY PRESIDENT CARL A. SWENSSON, A. M., PH. D.

The Lutheran Church has been the educator of nations for centuries. One of her best and most fruitful characteristics has ever been her unceasing care for the Christian and liberal bringing up of her children and youth. Luther took a strong stand upon this important question already from the beginning, and the Church, which received his sainted name, has been the kind and loving mother of schools, colleges and universities in many countries. She is preëminently the Church of Learning. The great Lutheran countries of Germany and Scandinavia (Sweden, Norway and Denmark) are noted for their splendid public school system and consequent small per centage of illiteracy (4 per cent. in Germany and 3 in Scandinavia). They have numerous and thorough-going colleges with a well defined and equally well

tried curriculum. Their universities are the best in the world. No further praise can be added or is possible.

The Swedish Lutherans of America have been true to the traditions of their Church. Their oldest institution of learning antedates in the beginning of its work the organization of the Augustana Synod. In the several Conferences educational endeavors have run parallel with the first attempts at mission work. The college of the Minnesota Conference had its humble beginning some years before the organization of our Synod. To this fact of far-seeing interest in Christian education can be traced much of the wonderful success accorded by God in his kind Providence to the Swedish Lutherans of America.

The south-western territory of said Synod is called the Kansas Conference and comprised originally all the territory west of the Missouri river and south of Dakota. At present this Conference is composed of the states of Kansas, Colorado, Texas and a small portion of Missouri. The Kansas Conference was organized twenty-five years ago and celebrates its quarter centennial at the the annual meeting which is to be held at Lindsborg, March 12-17 this Spring. The time of the Indian and Buffalo, of the wild, unbroken prairie and the little dug-out, is of such recent date that speaking of even the quarter centennial seems unnatural. The flight of time is so swift in the west, that the occurrences of twenty years ago seem to have happened but yesterday. Our beautiful towns and villages, our many railroads and the hundreds of well equipped farms testify, however, to the fact that the beginning cannot be of very recent date. Some of the trees planted by the writer are already more than five feet in circumference.

The founders of the Kansas Conference were loyal to the cause of Christian Education. Parochial schools were established very early. In this county our first settled Lutheran pastor, now President Olsson of Augustana College, Rock Island, was also the first superintendent of public instruction. Dr. Olsson not only organized Sunday-school and parochial school work, as the other pioneers did, but he also gathered the young people of the colony for an evening school. Instruction

and drill in chorus singing, with Dr. Olsson as the willing and only available leader, was a part of the programme. A public library was also founded. In immigrating to this country with his friends from Vermland in Sweden, Dr. Olsson's plan was to found an ideal community, consisting of only good and truly Christian people, and a higher institution of learning was one of his fond day-dreams.

Then Dr. Olsson accepted a call from Augustana College at Rock Island. The writer was chosen as his successor and was installed as pastor in July, 1879. I entered into the work with all the hopes and ambition of early youth, but it soon became apparent to me that if our Swedish Lutheran colonies were not to disappear in the near future, without leaving any permanent impress upon the religious and intellectual conditions of our state, they must have an institution of learning in their midst. This was only twelve years from the very beginning of the settlement, and means and prosperity were equally scant. My inexperience, love for the work and trust in God made the impossible look comparatively easy. The plan comprised only an academy so far. I consulted with the neighboring pastors and they were willing that an attempt should be made, provided I would shoulder the financial responsibility. An instructor was engaged and the writer constituted the other half of the Faculty. Announcements were published in the church papers and made from the pulpits of our congregations. On October 15th, 1881, Bethany Academy was to begin its work in the school-room of our Bethany Lutheran Church at Lindsborg. At the appointed hour not a single student was present, and our little academy was found to consist of two instructors and no students. Our attendance during the first year was twenty-seven, and, thanks to the first Swedish Lutheran Oratorio Society of the West, which donated the net proceeds of several Messiah concerts to our treasury, the first contribution it received, we closed the academic year with a surplus of \$20. The next year Prof. Nelander, Bethany's first President, was called. Our Bethany Lutheran Church donated five acres of ground, an old public school building was purchased, moved upon the present ground and re-

ceived an addition, making it 60 x 24 ft. This second year opened with an attendance of forty-two. The following table will show what the attendance has been since then up to the present time:

|         |     |         |     |         |     |
|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|
| 1882-83 | 92  | 1886-87 | 339 | 1890-91 | 334 |
| 1883-84 | 84  | 1887-88 | 340 | 1891-92 | 393 |
| 1884-85 | 105 | 1888-89 | 251 | 1892-93 | 422 |
| 1885-86 | 161 | 1889-90 | 306 | 1893-94 | 440 |

Times were good in the West and a feeling of general encouragement prevailed among the people. The present Ladies' Hall containing twenty-eight rooms was erected in 1883 and was at that time considered a very large building for our town and conference. It was used as a boys' dormitory and dining hall, but soon became entirely inadequate. In the meantime the control and ownership had passed first into the hands of the Smoky Hill district and later the institution became the property of the Kansas Conference. After many deliberations in the Board and in the Conference it was resolved at the meeting in Assaria, 1886, to erect the present main college building. It is a large brick structure, six stories high, 154 ft. long, 60 ft. wide, with a Chapel extension in the rear, 48 x 50. The building contains 140 rooms of which three are 65 x 50 each. It is modern in style, steam-heated and substantially built. The cost was largely in excess of the estimate, but the growth of Bethany has demonstrated that the structure is not any too large. The immediate pressing need of the institution is a larger Ladies' Hall and a Gymnasium.

With the growth of the institution, the plan also expanded. An academy was not deemed sufficient. We required a complete college and, in addition to that, departments of such a character that the sons of our Lutheran people could be educated for the different callings in life in accordance with their natural talents and bent of mind. A certain amount of elementary knowledge should be common to all and then every one ought to have the opportunity of choosing the special work that he is fit for. Agreeable to this plan the following departments were established in rapid succession: "College, Academic, Normal,

with Model School attached, a Conservatory of Music, a Commercial College and a School of Fine Arts. To the plan belong also a Manual Training School and a Department for Agriculture and Horticulture. Not only the intellect and will, but also the hand and eye should be trained, and an intelligent class of farmers is one of the best safeguards of the republic. The Manual Training Department was established some years ago, but because of the hard times it was deemed advisable to abandon it, temporarily at least.

The institution has been co-educational from the very beginning, and the results so far have amply justified the wisdom of this arrangement. A School of Cutting and Sewing belongs to the Ladies' Hall, but lack of means has hindered its full equipment so far.

We lay great stress upon the principle that the Church should provide a higher education for all of its members who may need or desire it. The writer's ideal is that each and every member of the Church should receive a good education not only in the public schools and the Sunday and parochial schools, but also in other more advanced courses of study. The idea of some that the Church need only educate its ministers is decidedly erroneous. If the Church educates the pastors and allows the world to educate the people, and more especially its professional and business men, the result must necessarily become unsatisfactory. Whether we love the present public school system or not, one thing seems to be plain, that *higher* education should always stand upon a firm religious basis. This principle alone fully justifies the existence of the denominational college.

The financial history of our educational work is worthy of a special chapter. We had not a dollar to begin with, and now after fourteen years the property is worth above all encumbrances about \$80,000. At first we resorted to the common subscription plan. Then we bought and platted lands adjoining the college site and realized a great deal of money from the sale of lots. Then the boom in the West collapsed. Next we resorted to five years' subscriptions which resulted in a good income to

the treasury. After that an attempt was made to collect for the entire indebtedness at one time; \$45,000 were raised in this manner. Then a Chicago Real Estate firm offered a favorable contract, but the panic of '93 proved disastrous to it. In 1894 the Conference decided upon the organization of "the army of five hundred individuals or churches," each of whom should contribute \$100 during a period of two years. Notwithstanding the hard times, a good beginning has already been made. Through the kindness of King Oscar of Sweden and Norway, Bethany has received two general collections in all the churches of Sweden, and through a legacy of a deceased friend it will receive \$4,000 in the near future.

Our people have shown great liberality, some firms and merchants having already donated from \$1,000 to \$3,000 each.

Two stipends have been founded, one by the Hon. Jno. A. Johnson and one by Dr. J. Rundstrom. Both are for the benefit of lady students.

Through the liberality of another friend, Mr. O. Heggelund, the library received, as a donation, 2500 volumes. It now contains 4,000 volumes and many pamphlets.

The one endowment, so far, of this college consists of some mining stock and four farms, the latter worth in the aggregate \$10,000. The farms were received as Christmas gifts some weeks ago. The intention is to continue the attempt of getting more farms as a safe and permanent investment. Many friends of education in the West could more easily donate a farm than a few thousand dollars in cash.

One of the special features of the educational work at Bethany College is the great attention paid to music. The institution has well organized departments for the piano, pipe-organ, violin, vocal culture and harmony. It has an orchestra of 25 pieces, and five military bands with a membership of seventy-five. Large classes in notation are formed every year, and the Oratorio Society renders the greater part of Handel's Messiah annually on the evening of Good Friday. Portions of Haydn's Creation have been executed and some of Mendelssohn's, Gounod's and other classical works have been rendered complete. The influ-



ence of the large musical festivals of the institution is not confined to the college and its nearest proximity, but is expanded every year, being recognized even by the railroad companies. Another feature is the School of Fine Arts, in which two European artists give instruction.

The underlying principle of these two departments of the work is that the Lord and his people have a better right than the world to everything that is truly beautiful and elevating.

Bethany's graduates from all departments number one hundred and sixty-five. Eleven of our former students are pastors in the Synod and sixteen are instructors or professors in higher institutions of learning. The first college class was graduated in 1891. It consisted of four members. The class of 1895 numbers thirteen members.

The communicant membership of the Kansas Conference is only about 7,000, but in point of attendance its institution of learning, Bethany College, is next to the largest Lutheran College in this country. This can be explained in the following manner: First, the work was begun at the right time. We lead instead of following others. In the second place, the many departments very naturally command a very large patronage. The wisdom of the plan is more and more justified by such results. In the third place, the management has always sincerely endeavored on the one hand to make the students feel at home at Bethany, and on the other hand to be in direct and sympathetic contact with our Lutheran and other patrons. In the fourth place, our professors and instructors have been and are young and ambitious men and women, able and willing to understand the peculiar needs of our conditions in the West, and satisfied with small salaries for double work. In the fifth place, we have not only believed in the efficacy of prayer, but also in the liberal use of printer's ink and hard work in general. Bethany is already an important and recognized factor of the intellectual life of the State. Our faithfulness to Lutheran doctrine has not made us exclusive and conservative in any odious sense of the terms.

Planted in God's providence near the geographical centre of our Republic, and having already attained such an unexpected

growth and influence, Bethany College is full of hope for a future of a yet greater usefulness. Faithful to God and our Church, it will be a power for good in promulgating the truth as it is in Christ during the centuries yet to come. Our prayers are that God may raise up mighty and willing friends whose wealth will be enlisted in the cause of Christian education as a permanent blessing to all the patrons of this institution.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### THE SOURCES OF LUTHER'S LANGUAGE.\*

BY PROF. KARL FRIEDRICH R. HOCHDOERFER, A. M., PH. D.

A truly great man is never one-sided. It is not Luther the theologian, not Luther the protestant, not Luther the actor in the drama of history whom I shall contemplate, but Luther the linguist. Though I cannot avoid touching other relations, I am concerned here with Luther as he lives in the language of his people, with the man who said: "To the Germans I was born, to the Germans I will render service." As there is no truer revelation of a nation's thought and heart, no clearer mirror of its life and history than its language and literature, you should catch from the subsequent remarks some glimpses of what Luther has been and is to the German-speaking people, and what he is to the scholar and student of their language. The subject limited in range is nevertheless complex. It has been treated in at least a desultory way by almost every historian of German literature. I am especially indebted to A. Treybe's "Martin Luther in Sprache und Dichtung," the most methodical and scientific treatise of Luther as a writer and a poet that has come under my notice. I invite you to read and think with me for the purpose of ascertaining Luther's relation to the history of the German mind. Reserving for myself the privilege of a guide allow me to call your attention to essential features and to main

---

\*A lecture delivered on the 9th of November, 1894, at the Fifth Lutheran Church, Springfield, Ohio.

currents of thought. You may not hear so much about Luther himself, but the great figure will stand out more clearly from the background. So in looking at Munkacszi's picture, "Christ before Pilate," your eye, attracted by the rich coloring and by artistic details, wanders hither and thither, but it rests finally, unable to turn away, on the simple and grand central figure of the Saviour.

Religious thought has influenced German language and literature and increased its wealth and depth more than any other element. The first document of importance which no student of Germanic philology can afford to pass by, is a translation of the Bible in the Gothic tongue. It is a monument of immortal merit, the first German prose, and seems almost to indicate the mission of the nation. This version is the work of Ulfilas, the bishop of the West Goths, who lived from 311 to 381. He created himself the alphabet out of Runic, Greek and Latin characters. Several fragmentary manuscripts of this oldest German document have been discovered, one in the abbey of Werden in the Rhine province in the sixteenth, another in Wolfenbüttel in the eighteenth century. The first, called Codex Argenteus, on account of its silver letters on red parchment and its silver binding, is the more important. Since the close of the Thirty Years' War it is in the Swedish University library of Upsala. Let me cite from it as a specimen of its sonorous language the Lord's Prayer: "Atta unsar, thu in himinam, veihnai namô thein; qimái thiudinassus theins; vairthai vilja theins, svê in himina, jah ana airthai;—hlaif unsarana, thana sinteinan, gif uns himma daga; jah aflêt uns, thatai skulans sijaima, svasvê jah veis aflêtam thaim skulam unsaraim; jah ni briggais uns in fraistubnjai. ak lausei uns af thamma ubilin; untê theina ist thiudangardi jah mahts jah vulthus in aivins. Amên.

Every man of the Teutonic race feels and hears in these sounds the language of his forefathers. The very name by which the Germans call themselves "Deutsche" is derived from the Gothic "thinda," which signifies "the people." Ulfilas' Bible is the most venerable treasure of the Germanic languages, being, as we have seen, over one thousand six hundred years old.

The Gothic is the elder sister of the other Germanic languages. The first monuments of the modern High German language reach into the seventh century; it has a history of more than a thousand years. In this course of time we may distinguish three stages: the First or Old Period extending to the close of the eleventh century or somewhat later; the Second or Middle Period extending to the time of the Reformation; the Third or New Period extending to our own present time. During the Old Period, which is richer in inflection and greater in constructive power, the language is early and extensively employed for Biblical Glosses: interlinear versions, vocabularies, commentaries and translations of the Bible. The latter confine themselves generally to the gospels, the real foundation of Christianity. Among these "Germanizers" of the Bible, as Flaccius Illyricus calls them, Hrabanus Maurus, Alcuin's pupil and abbot of the cloister of Fulda in 822, is to be mentioned. The "lectionarium" or collection of passages from the gospels and epistles to be read on Sundays in Church, is provided with German glosses for the use of clergymen. Here belongs also a work about the interpretation of Holy Writ (which shows a clear insight into the spirit of biblical literature) by the learned Notker Balbulus, author of hymn "Media Vita" (later adapted and deepened by Luther) and vigorous promoter of Church music. All these efforts received impulse and stimulus from Charlemagne who attempted to write the first German grammar himself and ordered the popular songs to be collected. To the great emperor the German language is deeply indebted. He fights already against the prevailing error that God could only be adored in the three languages written on the cross. A year before his death the Council of Mainz ordains that everybody be made thoroughly acquainted with the Lord's Prayer and the articles of faith permitting, for those who wish, the use of the German language. That the people availed themselves of this permission, is evident from the many extant German translations. Charlemagne's great aim was to make Christianity the basis of German culture. When he had ordered a "homiliarium" to be put together containing sermons of St. Augustine, Leo, Beda, *et al.*, he empha-

sized that the prescribed Bible text should be interpreted in German. The Council of Mainz, which I mentioned before, decreed: "That the sermon should not be omitted in the Holy Church, and, that in case of absence from home or sickness of the bishop, or other preventions, there should be always some one to preach the word of God in such a way as the people could understand;" that means, in German. This accounts for the many fragments of sermons that have come down to us from the first period of the German language. Let us not forget either that the missionaries, like Bonifacius and his successors, had to address the people of Hessa and Thuringia in the native tongue.

To the time of the Carolingians belongs likewise the oldest German life of Jesus composed in Low German alliterative poetry and based upon Matthew and, although of less literary merit, more important for the development of the language, because written in High German, the "Christ" of Otfrid von Weisenburg, a life of the Saviour founded upon a combination of the four gospels. (It is also the first work in which the rhyme is employed.)

The spirit of Charlemagne and of the school of Hrabanus Maurus, lived on during the reign of the Ottonian emperors who however on their part did little for the propagation of German culture. The picture of the development of the German language in its First stage would be incomplete without mention of the man whom his pupils in appreciation of his merits called 'Teutonicus,' but who is better known as Notker Labeo, that is Notker with the big lips. Knowing German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew, he was considered one of the most learned men. As preceptor of the school of the cloister of St. Gallen in its most flourishing period about the year one thousand he used the German language as means of instruction. He encouraged his pupils who loved him, to translate into German, guided their efforts and set an example by a smooth and clever translation of many portions of the Bible. Unfortunately most of his writings are lost, but we can form a judgment about the high character of his work from the still extant versions of the psalms and of some lyrical parts of the Old and New Testa-

ments. (These documents were published in 1883 for the celebration of Luther's four hundredth anniversary). During the whole period, the reading of the Bible formed the basis of instruction in the schools, and we possess more than forty manuscripts with continuous Latin-German Bible commentaries. The Church laid especial stress upon the confessional service, the origin of which may be traced to Charlemagne's teacher, Alcuin, the greatest theologian of his time. As private and public confession was held in German, the Latin formulas had to be translated. I close this period with a literal translation of the *German* ritual of the service of the cloister of St. Gallen: The clergyman makes a short 'confession address' admonishing the congregation to put away sin and to remain faithful to the baptismal vow in order that their prayer may be heard and they may become partakers of eternal life. 'Whoever,' he says, 'is anxious to consider this in true repentance and does sincere penance, lift up his heart and speak after me: I renounce the devil and all his works, etc. Then follows the apostolic creed, after which the congregation or one of their number pronounces the confession. This is followed by the absolution: If you have done this with inwardness of mind and if you are desirous to fulfill in your actions what you have promised with your lips, then is open to you my Lord's grace in respect to everything you may ask for the blessedness of your body and your soul.'

Do not these words sound familiar to your ears? Do they not call up to your mind the language of Luther?

I come to the Second or Middle Period of the German language, extending from the close of the eleventh century to the time of Luther. During the twelfth century few changes take place; during the thirteenth the formation of dialects begins. The two main branches are the Saxon and the Suabian. The latter becomes the language of the court and develops the great Middle High German literature which has been brought to a new life and recognized as a powerful factor for the deepening of the national spirit in the present century. I shall have to pass it by here; it was not the language of the people. It has been questioned, and justly, whether there was in our Second

Period such a thing as a language commonly recognized for the use in writing. The Christian Church, once well established, returned to the old disastrous notion, rejected already by Charlemagne, that the Latin language was the only proper vehicle of ecclesiastical thought. It denied to the German language its sanction and treated it as a barbarian tongue. To say the most, it tolerated it where it could not do otherwise. Here and there a man arose who in true understanding of the people's need preached in German. Such endeavors to popularize the Gospel were hailed with delight. The Franciscan monk, Berthold von Regensburg, about the middle of the thirteenth century, is reported to have drawn audiences compared with which the attendance at Moody's services may be deemed small.

Tauler's '*Theologia deutsch*' written in the next century was much read. But tendencies like these were in opposition to the established notions of the Church and found little encouragement. Can we wonder at the rapid decay of the language in consequence of this selfish policy? How pernicious this influence has been to unity in speech, how far reaching in its effects, may be seen from Professor Behaghel's undoubtedly correct statement that even 'at present the Westphalian peasant and the Swiss herdsman are able to understand one another as little as a Frenchman and a Chinaman.' Official documents coming from the North could not be understood in the South of Germany. The adoption of a language which might be understood in the different parts of the realm became an urgent necessity. For various reasons the Upper Saxon dialect, spoken in and around Magdeburg and in the cities of Meissen and Silesia, obtained a supremacy. The Emperor Maximilian and his chancellor, Niklas Ziegler, spread deeds and documents written in this official language all over the country and deserve honorable mention for their earnest endeavors. The chancery of the Saxon electorate followed this example and approached the language of the Imperial chanceries. This first step towards unity in the written use of the language is momentous, though its im-



port has been overestimated. But, however small, it was a beginning, a right principle was stated.

What was needed was a creative spirit : a great cause, a great man, a great work. These conditions were soon to be realized : the great cause was the Reformation of the Church, the great man was Luther, his great work the translation of the Bible. No man was ever better fitted for his task. He sprang, as Koestlin says, from a firm tough race, deeply rooted in the native soil. I am a peasant's son, he says himself; my father, grandfather and great-grandfather have been genuine peasants. He was a Saxon; in Meissen a good German was spoken. His travelings freed him from local influences. Living in Magdeburg, Eisenach, Erfurt and Wittenberg, he came in touch with the different shades of the language. His correspondence with all parts of Germany could not help furnishing him with an abundance of linguistic material. Tables, benches, chairs, window-sills, drawer and book cases, were, according to his own expression, always filled with letters, most of them asking for spiritual advice. Since 1516, he read eagerly the sermons of Tauler whose *'Theologia deutsch'* was published by him for the first time. No doubt the study of Tauler was helpful to him; more so than the language of the chanceries. Some men have attributed to the latter too great an influence upon Luther, misguided by his own utterance : I speak according to the Saxon chancery. This means simply : I have adopted the principle laid down by this authority, *i. e.* to free the language from local influences. What Luther had to say was very different from the contents of legal documents, in style, tone and expression. Dr. Jonas' statement at Luther's funeral that the chanceries learned from him how to write and speak German, deserves more credit. Luther says himself in another place : "Nobody cares to speak genuine German, especially not those gentlemen of the Chanceries (and those vile preachers and affected scribblers)." The foundation upon which Luther built was a firmer rock, it was the old language of the First Period. Suppressed for centuries it lived on like a river flowing for a time underground. "God is to be thanked," says George the Prince of Anhalt in the first decades of the Reformation, "that in spite

of it (referring to the corruption of the clergy) our parents, and especially our mothers, have remained our best house ministers and bishops through whom the articles of faith and prayer have been preserved." Here are the channels by means of which the Old High German language came to Luther. No man can create an artificial language and force it upon a nation. In Luther the work of Ulfilas, of Charlemagne, of Notker, and of the whole past is consummated. It is the crowning result of the effort of a people to clothe its religious longings in a national garb. All the essential expressions of Christian faith, an immense mass of biblical terms and phrases, had obtained citizenship. The clay was there, Luther breathed into it a living soul. The quiet monks of Fulda, of St. Gallen and other cloisters, forged the weapons for the great Reformer, when they offered the word of God in German to the people and employed the language in Christian poems. Their work is finished in Luther who began nothing anew, but brought all the hidden germs and seeds to full blossom. The incorporation of Christianity into German thought and poetry was the goal of the way the greater half of which had been traveled by the end of the eleventh century; the full embodiment into the spirit of the nation was effected by Luther. The greatness of the man lies in his understanding of the national mission and his strong sympathy taught him the right means. Luther did not reject what was offered to him, he did not even try to change the naturalized terms handed down from Latin and from German mythology, as "Kreuz," English cross, from Latin *crux*; "Hölle," English hell, from O.H.G. *hela*, the mythological abode of the departed spirits; "Kirche," English church, itself has, in spite of leading dictionaries, probably nothing to do with the Greek *κυριακή*, but is derived from a word signifying "rock, stone," and points to a time when erratic blocks were used for the purpose of sacrifice; "Sonntag," English Sunday, is in O. H. G. *Sununtag*, the day of the sun. It would be easy to multiply this list. Luther has translated the Bible into an existing Christian language. In his translation the nation recognized itself as a nation and took back its rightful inheritance for which it had been longing.

The fact that there was a complete translation of the Bible a century before Luther, and had run through fourteen editions up to the year 1518, besides eight translations of the Psalms, two of Revelations *et al.*, is of very little significance. They were based upon the Vulgate, while Luther's is founded upon the original Greek and Hebrew. They were full of misunderstandings, awkward, heavy and only of local import. The nation took little notice of them. Luther's version commended itself at once to the people, for, aloof from dialectical, local and personal barriers, it made the Bible universal property. The Germans found here their own language as spoken in the market-places and in the work-shops, as spoken by mothers and children, as spoken by men of whatever rank or condition of life. We admire, besides, in this work a monument of German industry, patience and genius. From the first edition of the New Testament in 1522 to his last edition of the Bible in 1545 Luther constantly revised and improved the text. Especially visible is this in the Psalms: the earlier edition of 1524 is, according to Luther, nearer the Hebrew and farther from the German, the later of 1532 nearer the German and farther from the Hebrew.

Ps. 73, vss. 25 and 26 read in the first edition: "Whom have I in heaven, and on earth nothing pleases me, when I am with thee. My flesh and my heart is faint, God is my heart's treasure and my portion eternally." This is a close rendering of the Hebrew text, it stands nearer to it than the English version. The second edition reads: 'If I have only thee, I do not care for heaven and earth. Though body and soul faileth, thou art, oh God, my heart's comfort and my portion forever.' This second rendering is certainly quite a way from the Hebrew text, much farther than the English version, but it is thoroughly German, it is free, but undoubtedly correct. The principle of Luther's translation is not literalization, not a slavish adherence to the letter, but spiritualization. The true translator must understand the nation like the true poet, its inmost thought and imagination; he must be able to watch the gentlest vibrations of the national pulse. The spirit of holy enthusiasm which in the times of Bonifacius opened new countries to Christianity is the

spirit of Luther, but in addition the national spirit. He lived himself, body and mind, into the revelation, he lived in and with the authors of the Bible, but he lived also in and with the people, whose soul lay open to him. Here lies the secret of the power of Luther's translation, and its immediate popularity. It is not a mere translation born of deepest experience, it is a popular book in the fullest and best meaning of the word: 'a monument of German literature and a landmark in its history.'

---

## ARTICLE X.

### REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*Institutes of The Christian Religion.* By Emanuel V. Gerhart, D. D., LL. D., with an Introduction by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. Vol. II. Embracing Doctrine on the Adamic Race; Jesus Christ; the Holy Spirit; Personal Salvation; and the Last Things. pp. 938.

This volume completes Prof. Gerhart's great work, of which an extensive notice appeared in the *QUARTERLY* for January, 1892. It gives no reason to abate the warm terms of appreciation then expressed relative to the ability, independence, conservatism and reverence of the author. His two solid octavos, containing 1744 pages, deserve a place alongside of the famous theological Systems of the late Dr. Charles Hodge and the late Dr. W. G. T. Shedd, and like those it can boast the merit of having in it nothing modern. Minds of such a compass have not tired of the old dogmas, and though no cant is more familiar than the announcement that Calvinism is dead, the stern reformer is not unlike Moses, among other things also in this, that no matter how often he is put aside, he has an uncommon faculty for turning up again in due season.

Dr. Gerhart is, indeed, not a Calvinist in the strictest sense. We have not found so much as the word predestination, and in speaking of election he tells us that "God's will as uttered by election may be resisted, and it may fail of its end." But he is not a Lutheran either, and, as a rule, where his theology differs from the Lutheran it is essentially Calvinistic, or else, to the writer at least, it becomes either somewhat hazy, or in a measure seemingly inconsistent with itself. Take the *Descensus* for an instance: "In Hades Christ reaches the lowest stage of his mediatorship." "Hades is the penalty, the ultimate stage of the penalty of the transgression of the moral law." "Here

the last issue under the law of condemnation confronts the Mediator." Then right upon this we are told, "Hence the victory achieved by him over sin and the kingdom of darkness is not hidden under any lower stage of condescension, but it asserts itself in the character of a victory." Thus, the *Descensus* belongs at once to the state of humiliation and to that of exaltation, and this may in a sense be so, but the same can be affirmed of the death on the cross. In neither case, however, are we thus helped to clearness of thought.

A defect in the system so ably delineated occurs, to our mind, in the discussion of the office of the ministry, which fails to distinguish between the office of ministering word and sacrament, an office belonging to the entire congregation, and the office of the ministry which is spoken of as "an order of Christian men," an order of men designated as "one condition of the Christian community."

But a Lutheran is struck most of all by the failure to develop fully the Christological dogma. In a work which emphasizes the Christocentric principle and which avowedly revolves on the divine-human personality of Jesus Christ, one would expect "the great mystery of godliness," the vital and eternal union of God and man in one theanthropic personality, to be the subject most amply treated. It seems to be studiously avoided. There are chapters on the Advent of Jesus Christ, on his Birth, Circumcision, Normal Development, Temptation, Mediatorship, Ministry, &c., treating these topics for the most part historically, but there is scarcely an allusion to the catholic faith formulated at Chalcedon, concerning the One and the Same Christ to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably*, the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one person.

The enrichment and development of this truth in the Lutheran System, with its ineffable practical value in directing faith to a Redeemer who, wherever he is in heaven or on earth, and whatever he does on the cross, in hell or on the throne, possesses every moment both natures in their perfection, is a subject, to say the least, worthy of consideration in so comprehensive and able a work as the Institutes of the Christian Religion.

E. J. W.

JAMES CHRYSTAL, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

*Authoritative Christianity.* The Six Synods of the Undivided Church, its only utterances: "Those six Councils which were allowed and received of all men." *The Third World Council*; that is the third Council of the whole Christian World, East and West, which was held A. D. 431 at Ephesus. Vol. I., which contains all of Act I. Translated by James Chrystal, M. A. 8vo. pp. 769. Sold to subscribers at \$3.00 a volume; to others at \$4.00.

We may not accept the dogma of an infallible Church, but we recognize as binding the command to honor father and mother, and we do not hesitate to hold up as a prodigal child any professed branch of the

Christian Church which ignores, neglects or despises the voice of Holy Mother Church in those centuries when she represented and spoke for the whole Christian world.

The chief translator and publisher has assumed a prodigious task in undertaking to bring out in English the decisions of the six ecumenical Councils, "all the decisions of the whole Church before its division into East and West," but he is doing a good work, prompted evidently by love for the truth, and he will have his reward. As these Acts have never before been translated into any modern tongue, his laborious contribution to theology and church history merits the appreciation of scholars throughout the whole of English-speaking Christendom.

Vol. I., giving the Acts of the Council of Nicaea, all its genuine remains in Greek and English, appeared some time since. The present volume, though quite bulky, is confined to Act I. of the Council of Ephesus, which makes up about one-half of the whole bulk of the Minutes. The translation follows the original Greek. Copious and learned notes enrich the volume, some of which are of course open to criticism, while others are to be much commended for the force with which they dissipate unhistorical and absurd notions in regard to this much-abused Council.

The translator would have made an earnest and strong colaborer of Calixtus in the seventeenth century, in promoting Church Union on the basis of the Ecumenical Councils, and he evidently rests all hopes of a reunited Church on the acceptance of the decisions of those Councils as authoritative, "the voice of that whole Church which Christ commands us to hear." But in his ardent devotion to Anglicanism, he does not spare some of the Tractarians. John Keble, for instance, not knowing the error for which Theoderet was condemned, made his "condemned heresy the basis of his own errors on that sacred rite. And the heresiarch and idolatrizer, E. B. Pusey, being ignorant of parts of the Decisions of the Council fell into the same heresy."

The enterprise which offers to Christian scholars a work like this today can but be commended as meritorious and timely. The Anti-Nicene Fathers, the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, are being widely circulated in an English translation. Certainly the carefully formulated testimony of the whole Church of that period is of incomparably greater importance.

E. J. W.

T. Y. CROWELL AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*History of the Christian Church.* By Henry C. Sheldon, Author of "History of Christian Doctrine," and Professor in Boston University.  
5 vols. 8vo.

The field covered by Christianity in its march through the ages has become so vast, that a work attempting to comprehend in some measure its whole extent is rarely undertaken. Dr. Sheldon's effort, which in five good-sized volumes of about 600 pages each, traverses the whole

area from the Nature of the Christian Church to the latest survey of modern missions, is beyond question the amplest that has yet been made by an American author—for Dr. Schaff was a man of European training and methods.

It is a work not intended for specialists, but for the general reader, "designed to occupy a middle position between a mere compendium and those ponderous works which by their very mass are discouraging to all but professional investigators." And its orderly arrangement and its clear and attractive style are well adapted to secure popularity.

The author's merits as a historian have long been recognized through his "History of Doctrine." And while certain positions and not a few statements in these volumes will draw the fire of sharp criticism, his scholarship and ability are not in danger of serious attack. Of the five volumes one is devoted to the Early Church, one to the Mediaeval Church, and three to the Modern Church. This gives a fair specimen of the kind of perspective which marks the entire work. To compress the Church's progress for a thousand years, in which are embraced the transition of Europe from pagan barbarism to the eve of the Reformation, with the development of the Papacy, Monasticism and Scholasticism, three of the mightiest forces that have ever laid hands on human society, may commend itself to an intensely anti-Romish writer, but it is not history. It would have been better, we think, to have given a somewhat fuller view of mediaeval tendencies and results, even if such recent subjects as "the Parliament of Religions," "Mormon and Socialistic Communities," &c., &c., would have thereby been necessarily excluded. The idea of proportion which assigns to the Wesleyan movement a few more pages than to Luther and his work, strikes us as also as defective, but that may be due to a Lutheran bias.

• The mistake of confounding "a small party of Moravians" with the Salzburg Lutherans in the ship which brought John Wesley to Georgia, has been corrected so often that the repetition of it here is somewhat surprising. So is the failure to connect "the great revival" of the eighteenth century with Spener and the Pietists. A meritorious service to truth is rendered, however, by noting the affinity between the Ritualists and the earlier Oxford Methodists, who had in truth something of the disposition of the true Sacramentalists, and were nicknamed Sacramentarians. "They accredited much authority to Christian antiquity, and were scrupulous upon points of ceremonial. In these respects, as well as their ascetic bias, they prefigured to some extent the Ritualistic party of the present century." With the exception of sacerdotal millinery, &c., "the Oxford Methodists were the predecessors of the present Ritualistic party of the Church of England." Here is a rich field yet to be fully explored, and rich lessons yet to be learned on the relation of spiritual earnestness to religious rites.

Equally commendable is the author's unflinching fidelity to truth on



the subject of Sunday in the early Church. Noting indications that from the outset "the first day of the week was a special day to Christians," he holds that "all the writings of the first three centuries are destitute of any intimation," that the Jewish Sabbath was transferred from the last to the first day of the week. And not one of the Fathers "betrays the least consciousness that the Fourth (Third) Commandment was to be looked upon as applying to Sunday." "So far were the early Fathers from seeing in Sunday the old Jewish Sabbath \* \* that we find several of them specifying the abolition of the latter." "Tertullian refers the obligation to abstain from business on Sunday, not to any Old Testament command, not even to Apostolic tradition, but to the need of having the outward conditions favorable to that state of mind which is appropriate to the day." "No doubt the requirements of public worship made it in part a day of abstinence from secular toil. But on the other hand there is no indication of any positive prohibition of such toil within the first two centuries." The Reformers are receiving their vindication and that from New England Puritans.

One of the most valuable features of Vol. V. is its discriminating appreciation of German criticism and its classification of German theologians. The whole work may be commended as an enrichment to any library.

E. J. W.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*New Testament Theology*, or Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity according to the New Testament Sources. By Dr. Willibald Beyschlag, Professor of Theology at Halle. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Two volumes. pp. 419, 522. \$6.00 net.

Prof. Beyschlag has long held a foremost position among the great theologians of Germany. The present work is "the product of many years of theological occupation with the New Testament," "the favorite task" of his life, and is undoubtedly one of the most important theological publications which have lately issued from the German press. It has ordinarily a style of remarkable clearness and energy and the author has found in Mr. Buchanan a translator of uncommon capacity for lucid and vigorous English.

The form of the great work is attractive, the method claims to be scientific. The author occupies "the standpoint of historical criticism as the only possible one to-day for scientific theology in dealing with the Scriptures," and he unreservedly renounces the inferences drawn from "that antiquated theory of inspiration which has done more to encumber the Bible than to illumine it." Still he feels himself in fundamental opposition to the modern criticism prevalent since the days of Baur, and is impelled to exhibit "a great unison in the biblical doctrine

VOL. XXV. No. 2.

of salvation, a substantial agreement even between Paul and the original Apostles, and between Paul and Jesus himself, in all that is important." Except "in a very modified way," he has "not any scriptural support to proffer for the traditional Creed of the Church," in fact he "maintains a radical distinction between the harmonious biblical doctrines and the current formulæ of the Church."

The teaching of Jesus and of his Apostles as drawn from the New Testament sources, according to the boasted so-called scientific treatment, proves of course that the Church for nearly twenty centuries was groping in the grossest error as to her Founder and Head. From the very first the Christians offered worship to Christ as God, but "the very name Son of God witnesses against this." It always presupposes the human essence of those to whom it is given. "It distinguishes its bearer from God himself and therefore marks him out as human." Jesus may have cherished the idea of a special divine descent, but that "would only amount to a conviction of having come forth from God as a human personality in a unique way." "The consciousness of Jesus was at bottom purely human," and this "cannot possibly be harmonized with a consciousness of being himself God." Jesus could not possibly have accepted the name 'Son of God' and applied it to himself in a sense suggestive of divinity. "According to all the laws of speech, the Son of God must be conceived as a being different from God, that is human." "Possible," "impossible," "must," "cannot," these are the determining factors in Rationalistic interpretation. That is the short cut to the solution of every problem. And that is scientific!!

But did not Jesus claim for himself pre-existence, was he not conscious of having passed from a former heavenly life into an earthly existence? Dr. B. admits that in Jno. 3: 13; 6: 62 "the Son of Man is thought of as preëxistent." "It is a fact that the Johannine Christ claims for himself a previous heavenly life." "Jesus, according to John, knows himself to be the personal Logos or eternal Son of God, who before he became incarnate into the world lived in heavenly glory with the Father, and brought into the world with him the memory of that pretemporal and superhuman existence. But is not that to use the trinitarian notions of the fourth and fifth centuries, as a key to the mysterious elements of the discourses of Jesus?"

That would not be scientific? Beyschlag seems to ignore the science of history, whose task it is to discover the origin of those trinitarian notions. He finds another key lying "still nearer," a key that dispenses with historic inquiry. "In the circles to which Jesus historically belonged, preëxistence was by no means a quite new idea. Everything holy and divine on earth \* \* was traced back to a heavenly original in which it preëxisted before its earthly appearance." In the various utterances of Jesus on the subject, "preëxistence is simply the concrete form given to an ideal conception." The objection to substituting "an

ideal preexistence in the decree of God" for "the real existence of a personality distinct from God" taught in Christ's utterance, appears to the author "very unimportant; not only because it rests upon the literal accuracy of John's reports of the words of Jesus, which cannot be maintained, but still more because it imparts a modern distinction into the exposition of biblical words." That of course disposes of it. Plato is a more reliable teacher than John, or the Church's theology. And Paul, too, fails to keep distinct, idea and personality, for "to him the self-revelation of God was no abstract idea, but an ideal reality, a hypostasis, and for that very reason an actual person." And it was this "formal defect" of the Apostles, which "made the point of departure for the development of Christology." That is, the Church's theology rests upon the Scriptures, and that theology can be undermined only by attacking the accuracy of the Apostles. It is a question simply of Apostolic or Rationalistic infallibility.

E. J. W.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, PHILADELPHIA.

*Holy Types*: or, The Gospel in Leviticus. A Series of Lectures on the Hebrew Ritual. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D. Author of Lectures on the Gospels and Epistles of the Church Year, on Daniel, etc., etc. New Edition. pp. 403. 12mo. \$1.00

The distinguished author is to be commended for bringing out a new edition of this work, one of the most popular and edifying of his very numerous publications. While several editions were issued in this country and in England soon after its first appearance in 1859, it has for years been practically out of print. The aim of the work is to supply a popular exposition of the Levitical rites and ceremonies, to trace their typical import and relations, and to set forth the great features of the Gospel as therein adumbrated by types of God's own choosing. It professes to find in these divine appointments and directions a symbolic foreshowing of the whole plan of grace and salvation. Its careful reading can only enrich one's knowledge of the Scriptures and move him to admire "the wondrous plan" of that living Temple, whose foundation was laid by Moses and whose walls to the capstone were built by Jesus Christ.

Dr. Seiss steers clear of the "Higher Criticism." He keeps silent about "the Priest-Code." His readers will be none the poorer for this. Yet, without questioning Moses' authorship of Leviticus, we seriously at the present stage of criticism doubt the wisdom of saying: "If what it contains be true, \* \* it is impossible to suppose that any but he could have written it." At all events it would be well to allow the so-called critics and scientists, whose favorite stock term is "impossible," to have a monopoly of their own cant. A man ought to possess at least a measure of omniscience before he pronounces anything impossible.

E. J. W.

*Bibliographia*: A classified list, with literary notices, of the published works of Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D.

This pamphlet of 63 pages is a revelation of the prodigious intellectual activity of Dr. Seiss. How a pastor serving large congregations with a splendid record in the pulpit, and for years doing editorial duty, and bearing all the time his share of the burdens of committee work, can command the time to prepare volume after volume on a great variety of subjects, homiletical, expository, eschatological, historical, educational, catechetical, liturgical, musical, poetical, controversial, etc., etc., is a question to which the reviewer, himself a busy man, can furnish no answer. There are at least thirty considerable volumes with a multitude of sermons, tracts and addresses. Dr. Seiss has celebrated his jubilee in the ministry, but many jubilees will have passed before his eloquent voice ceases to be heard in his writings which the printer has made indestructible.

E. J. W.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, NEW YORK.

*Outlines of Christian Theology.* By Rev. Cornelius Walker, D. D., Professor of Systematic Divinity in the Theological Seminary of Virginia. pp. 256. \$1.50.

Our Episcopal brethren are not much given to the publication of theological works. The present modest volume shows that this short-coming is not due to lack of ability, and, one would think that with so intelligent a clergy there should not be wanting a generous demand for such a treatise. The author does not exhaust himself and his readers by wrestling with the latest German theology, but sets forth in a simple lucid form the elements of the Christian faith after the good old-fashioned method.

How acceptable this work will prove to the dominant High-Churchism, we shall watch with interest. It is thoroughly Low-Church, and, what is often called, evangelical. It makes no claims for Episcopacy and finds the notes or features of the true Church to be, "Profession of Christ, the preaching of the pure word of God, and sacraments duly administered," which is a paraphrase of the Lutheran doctrine. "Its authority is limited by that of Scripture." "A Ministry is contemplated in Art. XXIII, the necessity of a lawful call and sending, by the duly authorized men for that purpose, and in Art. XXXVI the Episcopal Consecrations and ordinations of the Book of Edward VI., are accepted as free from superstition, and to be used in the English Church. But there is no affirmation as to its exclusive effect, or as to its bearing upon the validity of orders received elsewhere. The men who drew up these articles, as a matter of historic fact, accepted these orders—Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed—and with the two latter had communion. All lovers of truth must commend such candor.

On the predicates visible and invisible as applied to the Church, Dr. Walker has come to greater clearness than many others in different

denominations. Giving a brief history of this distinction, he says, the purposes of it, while expressing an important truth, "have largely passed away." His proposition that "it is a visible institution rooted in invisible and spiritual realities," is quite an improvement on the theory of Christ having two Churches, a visible one and an invisible one. Perhaps better yet is the suggestion of viewing the subject "under the aspects of the Church ideal and the Church actual." The value and interest of the work commend it to readers in every Church. E. J. W.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 27 W. 23D ST., NEW YORK.

*The Crusades: The Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.* By T. A. Archer and Charles L. Kingford. pp. 467.

*The Story of Vedic India: As Embodied principally in the Rig-Veda.* By Zénaïde A. Ragozin. pp. 457.

*Prince Henry the Navigator: The Hero of Portugal and of Modern Discovery.* 1394 to 1460 A. D. With an account of Geographical Progress throughout the Middle Ages as the Preparation for his Work. By C. Raymond Beazley, M. A., F. R. G. S. pp. 336.

*The Alhambra.* By Washington Irving. The Author's Revised Text edited by Arthur Marvin. Illustrated. pp. 523.

*The Arthurian Epic.* A Comparative Study of the Cambrian, Breton, and Anglo-Norman Versions of the Story \* \* and Tennyson's Idyll of the King. By S. Humphreys Gurteen, M. A., LL. B. pp. 437.

The first two of these five volumes belong to the "Story of the Nation" series; the third, to the "Heroes of the Nations" series; the fourth is the "Student's Edition" of Irving's *Alhambra*; and the fifth is a companion volume to "The Epic of the Fall of Man," by the same author, now in preparation, wherein he will give a comparative study of Cædmon, Dante, and Milton.

The story of the Crusades, already nearly eight hundred years old, will long be one of absorbing interest. Apart from their connection with their main object, the Crusades will always constrain the philosophic historian to trace their influence on the modes of life—political, ecclesiastical, social, commercial, and intellectual—of the peoples affected by them. These influences are discussed in the concluding chapters of the first book, and receive the most discriminating treatment.

It was the intention, at first, to give the second book the title of "Story of Vedic and Brahmanic India," but the large mass of material that accumulated led the author to confine himself to Vedic India. Brahmanic India will appear in a later volume. The careful methods of the author, as shown in the work before us, give encouraging promise for its successor.

To all who are interested in early geography and early discoveries, "Henry the Navigator" will prove to be of rare interest. We find that the Crusades, which had such a wide influence in other respects, was a

large factor also in extending geographical knowledge. On page 143 we read: "The three great discovering energies of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—in land travel, navigation, and science—were all seen to be results, in whole or in part, of the Crusades themselves." It will be found interesting, too, to trace the results of Henry's work and their influence on Columbus, as shown in the last chapter. This work, like the two preceding, is finely illustrated.

To the admirers of Washington Irving it will be gratifying to find his Alhambra appearing in this new and handsome dress. The text, we are assured, is that of the complete edition, revised by Irving himself. Dr. Buckley, in his work, "Travels in Three Continents" (noticed in this issue of the *QUARTERLY*) speaks of Irving and many other writers on the Alhambra as being misleading (page 50) because they give the impression that it is one building, whereas it is many. Unity may be lacking in the structure of the different parts, but is it not one, after all? This fault, if fault it may be called, will detract nothing from this fascinating book. We are glad to see it re-published.

"The Arthurian Epic" will enlist the interest of all readers familiar with Tennyson's "Idylls of the King." If, however, they are ardent admirers of the English Laureate, it will prove a disappointment to find that, in Mr. Gurteen's judgment, "his pictures are deficient in beauty in proportion to his departure from a strict fidelity to his originals" (p. 185). He notes this especially in his Vivien. By the Romancers her character is depicted as that of "a chaste, refined, ideally perfect woman, with no gross admixture, no repulsive traits of character or action." In Tennyson's hands she degenerates into the "wily Vivien" or "glissome Vivien." "He speaks of her as 'Vivien smiling saucily.' He calls her a 'lovely, baleful star,' even a 'wanton' and 'a harlot;' and the whole of the poem directly or by *innuendo* is but the development of Vivien's wiles." The only thing in common between the Vivien of Tennyson and that of the Romancers, he says, is the possession of the charm "to lay whom she would in magnetic sleep."

In further proof of his statement that Tennyson's pictures are beautiful only in proportion as he copies, Mr. Gurteen says: "The poem of *Lancelot and Elaine*, in our estimation is one of the finest, if not the finest, of the whole series of Tennyson's Arthurian poems. This estimate is based chiefly on the fact, that in this instance the poet has followed strictly the lines of the original romance; but in addition to this, it is based on the further fact that he has reproduced the tale with such exquisite beauty of thought and additional touches of fancy, that we can imagine what the delight of the Norman romancer would be, could he read his own narrative as reset in artistic verse by the nineteenth century *trouvère*."

All five of these books, like the Putnams' publications generally, are excellent specimens of the book-maker's art—well printed on fine, heavy paper and attractively bound.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, 51 EAST 10TH ST., NEW YORK.

*The Book of Numbers.* By Rev. Robert A. Watson, M. A., D. D. pp. 414.

*The Book of Daniel.* By F. W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., Archdeacon of Westminster. pp. 334.

The "Expositor's Bible Series," to which these two books belong, is nearing completion. The shelf it fills will prove a most helpful one in any man's library; and an attractive one, too, for the books are encased in elegant, uniform binding and present a fine appearance.

The style of Numbers, severe in its unadorned simplicity while relating the hardships of the time of wandering by Israel from one "wilderness" to another, is relieved by the pointed illustrations and happily drawn lessons given on nearly every page by the gifted expositor. In the "Book of Daniel," no one will complain that Farrar has not conceded enough to the so-called higher criticism. Its representatives will be gratified to find that he more than questions the historic existence of the Prophet Daniel. They will also find something to their taste in the chapter on "Peculiarities of the Historical Section" and still more in that on "Peculiarities of the Apocalyptic and Prophetic Section of the Book." In view of his many concessions it may be a comfort to some to read the following: "So far from undervaluing its teaching, I have always been drawn to this Book of Scripture. It has never made the least difference in my reverent acceptance of it that I have, for many years, been convinced that it cannot be regarded as literal history or ancient production. \* \* That Daniel was a real person, that he lived in the days of the Exile, and that his life was distinguished by the splendor of its faithfulness I hold to be entirely possible." And this: "Its right to a place in the Canon is undisputed and indisputable, and there is scarcely a single book of the Old Testament which can be made more richly 'profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, completely furnished unto every good work.'" The Introduction is a long one, covering 119 pages and divided into ten chapters, in which there is a discussion of such questions as the language of the Book, its general tone, its moral elements, its theology, peculiarities of its historic and prophetic parts, internal and external evidence for and against its genuineness, etc., closing with a chapter entitled "Summary and Conclusion." We quote a sentence from this chapter (page 118), which shows, in a few words, how the Expositor views the Book of Daniel as a whole: "Yet, so far from detracting from the value of the Book, we add to its real value and to its accurate apprehension when we regard it, not as the work of a prophet in the Exile, but of some faithful *Chasid* in the days of the Seleucid tyrant [Antiochus Epiphanes], anxious to inspire the courage and console the sufferings of his countrymen."



HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.

*Childhood in Literature and Art.* With some Observations on Literature for Children. A Study by Horace E. Scudder. pp. 253.

It is only in the nineteenth century that childhood has gained anything like a prominent place in literature. Along with this has come the recognition of childhood's need of a suitable literature and also the ample supply of that need. Our age abounds with books and periodicals for children. And, while the child was never wholly absent from literature, as the author shows in his chapters on the literature of the Greeks, Romans, Jews and Early Christians, it is in our own century that childhood is regarded with greater interest than in any previous age. It is true, as Mr. Scudder puts it: "The child is no longer a novelty either in poetry or in fiction. It is an accepted character, one of the *dramatis personæ* of literature." To cite Dickens' works, there are five or six child characters that make a specially deep impression on the minds of his readers, *e. g.*, Little Nell, Oliver Twist, Tiny Tim, David Copperfield in his early life, Paul Dombey. What an interpreter of childhood Hans Christian Andersen was. Among the writers of America, the child's paradise, it is enough to name Longfellow and Hawthorne. In following the author through childhood in *art* we feel that we are following a masterful guide no less than when he leads the way in the wide fields of *literature*. He seems to be equally at home in either. He adds to the attractions of a very interesting subject his well known clearness and force and freshness of literary style.

HUNT AND EATON, NEW YORK.

*Travels in Three Continents: Europe, Africa, Asia.* By J. M. Buckley, LL. D. pp. 614.

Next to seeing foreign lands yourself is to see them through the eyes of some one, who sees *what* you want to see and *as* you would want to see it, and who records his observations in a natural and entertaining way. Dr. Buckley meets these conditions admirably. His stay at any single place was usually short but his choice of objects of chief interest will generally meet with the reader's approval. If time is limited, the traveler, to make every hour tell to the best advantage, must know what to pass by as well as what to take in. But places of interest are not open to all travelers alike. Dr. Buckley, time and time again, gained admission where, to the average tourist, the gate is closed and remains closed. He, perhaps, was not always as successful in this respect as Dr. Henry M. Field, of the *New York Evangelist*, but enough so to satisfy the most exacting reader.

Then, too, his story is told in a way that will hold the attention with captivating interest, hour after hour, while reading it. There is no prolix narration to tire the reader, and yet each account is full enough to satisfy. He writes a book of travels, not of history. He uses his-

tory, uses it freely, but only to give the information necessary to make his description the more satisfactory. After giving about eighty pages to France and Spain and sixty to Northern Africa, he takes the reader to Italy, then to Egypt, to the Holy Land, to Cyprus and noted islands of the Ægean Sea, to the cities of Smyrna, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Constantinople, then back to Paris and New York.

The whole makes a large, attractive book of 614 octavo pages, fine paper, excellent letter press, well illustrated—a really sumptuous volume. The most of the illustrations are from recent photographs skillfully executed. The index is exceptionally full, covering forty pages in close, small type.

*The Problem of Religious Progress.* By Daniel Dorchester, D. D.  
Revised Edition with New Tables and Colored Diagrams.

The first edition of this book appeared in 1881. It created a sensation, and had a wide circulation. Its facts and figures corrected not a few erroneous views in regard to the moral and religious status of Christendom. The stand-point of the author was that of an intelligent optimism. The present edition is written from the same stand-point. The author is ardent in his hopes. But his hopes are sustained by an array of indisputable facts. He shows to the satisfaction of every lover of truth that the Christian world is not growing worse but better. The statistics are many, but in the hands of Dr. Dorchester they seem enchanted. Only official statistics are given. Hence they cannot be called in question. He certainly has fairly represented the Lutheran Church in this country, and if he has not distinguished between Lutherans and other Protestants in Germany, it is because the official statistics of Germany do not make any distinction.

The author writes in a glowing style, full of movement. The chief heads under which he treats his subject through 768 pages are: Faith; Morals; Spiritual Vitality; Statistical Exhibits; Appendix containing ecclesiastical and social statistics. The conclusion reached and proved to a demonstration is that under the benign influence of Christianity, the world of men is growing better. If in some places there is decline in faith and in morals, there is great improvement in others. The total impression is greatly in favor of progress.

The book will be a positive advantage to ministers as furnishing much material which can be lawfully used in the pulpit. J. W. R.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*The Ministry of the Spirit.* By A. J. Gordon, D. D. pp. 225. \$1.00.

The author starts out by remarking on the disproportionate attention which has been given to the person and work of the Spirit, as compared with that bestowed on the life and ministry of Christ. He very prop-

erly asks, "Why not employ the same method in writing about the Third Person that we use in considering the Second Person?" In employing the method suggested by this question the author seeks to exhibit the ministry of the Spirit. His key-thought is that the Spirit now abides in the Church to apply the redemption wrought by Christ.

He divides his work into ten chapters, as follows: "The Age-Mission of the Spirit;" "The Advent of the Spirit;" "The Naming of the Spirit;" "The Embodying of the Spirit;" "The Enduement of the Spirit;" "The Communion of the Spirit;" "The Administration of the Spirit;" "The Inspiration of the Spirit;" "The Conviction of the Spirit;" "The Ascent of the Spirit."

The discussion is sufficiently thorough to show that the author has made good use of his Greek Testament, and yet he gives us results rather than processes in exegesis. The treatment is sufficiently learned and accurate to meet the reasonable demands of scholarship, and yet sufficiently simple and popular to serve the needs of the lay reader. There is no reaching after novelty, and yet every page suggests fresh and independent investigation. The author has thought out the several chapters himself, evidently under the guidance of the Spirit, and by that illumination of the Spirit which comes from experience of the sanctifying energy of the Spirit. Without committing ourselves to every view expressed, we can cordially say that the reading of this book will quicken every Christian. Its pronounced trinitarianism furnishes a much needed tonic at this time.

J. W. R.

*The Argument for Christianity.* By Rev. George C. Lorimer, D. D., Minister at Tremont Temple, Boston. pp. 480. Price, \$2.00.

We are not lacking in works on Christian Evidences, and yet there is a place for this. Paley's was timely and adapted to the deism of his day. Fisher's "Grounds of Christian Belief" is well adapted to our times and presents the arguments for Christianity clearly and convincingly. And so of others. But such works as these are for the classroom. We want something for the cultured busy man of to-day that has, not less argument than these, but more in the line of illustration and attractiveness of style. Dr. Lorimer's book meets this want. While not lacking in forceful reasoning, it fairly bristles with telling incidents and rhetorical figures that make plain the argument and at the same time give pleasure to the reader. A good, substantial dish is made all the more appetizing and enjoyable, and none the less nutritious, by being tastefully garnished for the eater.

The line of argument, followed by the author, differs in some features from that of the accepted text-books, but not essentially. After an introductory chapter on Christianity and its Argument, he gives nine others containing arguments drawn respectively from History, Christ, Testimony, Miracles, Prophecy, Humanity, Achievement, Concession, Com-

parison. From first to last they are replete with convincing argument, the forcefulness increased throughout them all by vivid imagery and apt illustration. Along with them, too, is a glowing fervor that carries conviction, because the reader cannot help feeling that he is reading the thoughts of a man who is thoroughly in earnest. Several pages are given to a list of works quoted by the author, and these are followed by a copious index.

This book deserves a wide reading. It deserves it not only on account of the nature of the subject, but also because the subject is so well presented. The soul that is open to argument will likely be convinced. The soul of unbelief, that is exacting and stubborn, will likely remain closed to all argument, though an angel from the skies should speak. It is as Dr. Lorimer says in his closing paragraph: "Unless the intellect is teachable, very little progress will be made toward conviction. 'Be not faithless but believing' is an admonition needed to be addressed to multitudes in our own day, as to Thomas in times gone by."

*The Denomination and Its Colleges.* Three addresses by President B. L. Whitman, D. D., Alvah S. Hobart, D. D., and President E. B. Andrews, D. D., LL. D., delivered at the session of the Baptist Congress held at Detroit in November, 1894. Paper cover; pp. 48.

These addresses are on a timely subject and excellent in their treatment. They should have a wide reading.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN, ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.* Based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology, etc., etc. Second Edition, Revised. 1895. pp. 287. \$2.25.

The first edition of this book appeared in 1888. The changes and additions made in this second edition are not numerous, nor important in substance. They relate chiefly to bibliography, and seek to bring this part of the subject down to the present time. The book purports to be based on Luthardt's *Kompendium der Dogmatik*, but in reality very much that is important in the book is taken bodily from Luthardt's work. This statement applies especially to the definitions, and to very much of the bibliographical and historical information. For instance on p. 66 we have a definition of the material and formal principles of Protestantism. But with the addition of only a word or two it is a literal translation from Luthardt. Then follow two or more learned pages on "the distinction between Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism," which, with the exception of a paragraph doubtfully referred to Krauth, are taken bodily from Luthardt. This is only one out of a score of instances, and had we not read Luthardt's *Kompendium* we might have concluded that Dr. Weidner is exceedingly happy in making definitions and distinctions—qualities in which Luthardt preëminently excels. But

we are surprised that Dr. Weidner does not seem to know that Luthardt's book has passed beyond the seventh edition (1886).

What use the author has made of the unpublished lectures of the late Dr. Krauth we have no means of knowing, but suspect it is not far different from that which appears in relation to Luthardt. However, the book, doubtless because of the character of the sources whence it has been so largely taken, is a useful compend. It will certainly give one an excellent idea of Luthardt's system. Indeed we once heard Dr. Luthardt say: "Professor Weidner has translated my *Dogmatik*." We commend the book in its chief objective features to all who would like to have a bird's-eye view of the whole field of Dogmatic theology.

But we are amazed that any man could write in the closing decade of the nineteenth century a sentence like this: "A Lutheran is a Christian whose rule of faith is the Bible, and whose creed is the Book of Concord," p. 106. Besides the implied claim that the Bible and the Book of Concord are of equivalent authority in determining the faith of a Christian, the declaration ignores a great historical fact, viz.: that the Book of Concord has never been universally accepted by Lutherans; that there have been whole nations of Lutherans who have utterly rejected some of the contents of the Book of Concord, and indeed the Book itself as such. Does Dr. Weidner think there are no Lutherans in Denmark? Does he deny that there are Lutherans in Würtemberg, confessedly the most pietistic country in Germany? And what would he say of the immortal author of the Augsburg Confession? It is very certain that the Book of Concord was not and could not have been his creed. This may be an eye-opener for some who are fondly dreaming of a union with that body of the Lutheran Church which Dr. Weidner represents. But what will the great majority of the readers of the QUARTERLY think of this paragraph: "The General Synod is largely unionistic, but with growing elements of a more churchly character in faith and practice. There are two elements in it, the one laying a greater stress on the distinctive doctrines and usages of Lutheranism, and the other warmly encouraging all syncretistic plans of union," p. 132. We leave to the rhetoricians and logicians to reconcile "growing elements" and "two elements" in the General Synod. We proceed to deny the two chief allegations of the paragraph. It is not true that "the General Synod is largely unionistic." It may be safely assumed that there are not two scores of men in the General Synod who would elect to unite with Dr. Weidner on his standard of a Lutheran Christian. And it is absolutely false that there is an element in the General Synod "warmly encouraging all syncretistic plans of union." Dr. Weidner's attention was called to this offensive paragraph when it appeared in the first edition of his book. Now that he has continued it unchanged, we do not hesitate to say that he has perpetrated and perpetuated a defamation of the General Synod. Until his allegation is

proved by facts and names, we commend to him the eighth commandment and Luther's explanation of the same.

J. W. R.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Zweites Übungsbuch für den Unterricht in der deutschen Sprache.*

1895. pp. 79.

This is a book of exercises in German for the fifth and sixth years in an eight-years' course. It seems to be well arranged with lessons for reading and writing. A special feature is the attention given to the grammar of the language. The book can be profitably used without a teacher.

J. W. R.

---

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS.

Prof. Sloane in his life of Napoleon Bonaparte reaches in the April *Century* an absorbingly interesting period of Napoleon's Life,—namely, the rise of the conqueror, Bonaparte being now seen on a stage proportionate to his powers. Of the fiction in the number, Mr. Marion Crawford's *Casa Braccio* sails into smoother waters, and introduces to the reader Mr. Crawford's well-known character, Paul Griggs, and deals with the carnival season in Rome; Mrs. Burton Harrison's *An Errant Wooing* presents her characters at a typical bull-fight in Seville. There are three short stories: *A Search for an Ancestor*, by Mrs. Roger A. Pryor, which recounts a social transformation in New York; *A Faithful Failure*, by George I. Putnam, which deals with an army type; and *An Innocent Offender*, by Alice Turner, a humorous story of New England life.

Young children and old children will find articles to their taste in the April number of *St. Nicholas*. Stories, poems and pictures cover a wide field, as usual. Annie Matheson tells *A Fairy-Tale* without a Moral, and no one will miss such an appendage. Virginia Yeaman Remnitz has a true story, that is none the less interesting on that account. Two Little Americans at the Court of King Christian IX., were children of the American minister who were invited to an entertainment at the palace. The four serials, about the boy who had Aladdin's lamp, the page at Napoleon's court, the young lad among Captain Teach's pirates, and the three girls at college, all have generous instalments. There are also poems by Ella Wheeler Wilcox and Frederick B. Oppen.

The April *Atlantic Monthly* opens with two chapters of *A Singular Life*, by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. George Birkbeck Hill contributes his first paper on *A Talk over Autographs*. The other articles are *Flower Lore of New England Children*; *Dumb Foxglove*; *The Expressive Power of English Sounds*; two chapters of Gilbert Parker's *The Seats of the Mighty*; *Macbeth*, by John Foster Kirk; the second part of *Grace Howard Peirce's Gridon's Pity*; *The Basis of our Educational*

System, by James Jay Greenough; Robert Louis Stevenson, by C. T. Copeland. The poetry consists of an idyl on While the Robins Sang, by J. Russell Taylor, and two verses entitled In Memoriam Stevenson, by Owen Wister. The Contributors' Club and notices of new books have their usual excellence.

The April *Harper's Magazine* presents unusual attractions both in interest of reading matter and excellence of illustration. The opening paper on Our National Capital, by Julian Ralph, deserves the leading place given it. Among the other articles are these: Paris in Mourning, by Richard Harding Davis; Part I of Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc, translated from the French by Louis De Conte; Club Life among Outcasts; Part V of Thomas Hardy's Hearts Insurgent; Venice in Easter—Impressions and Sensations, by Arthur Symons; Autumn in Japan, by Alfred Parsons (with twenty-one illustrations); Recent Progress in the Public Schools, by W. T. Harris. Several poems are included, and the Editor's Study and Drawer complete a most excellent number.

*Table Talk* for April has an eye to the season in many of its articles. The first one is entitled Etiquette of the Spring Season. Easter Lilies is the title of some very pretty verses. The dietetic lesson is on Digestion. Answers to Housekeepers' Inquiries are suggestive and helpful—as they always are. Other parts of the contents are, The Peanut as a Food Constituent; Literature of Childhood; White-House China, 1829-1877; New Menus for April; The Market List; Are Women too Domestic? Dinner with Richard Wagner; Fashionable Luncheon and Tea Toilets.

*Vick's Floral Guide* for 1895 quite surpasses anything of the kind that we have had. It is really a work of art—printed in seventeen different colors. Any one wishing seeds or plants of any description can certainly obtain them at as reasonable prices and as choice a quality from James Vick's Sons, Rochester, N. Y., as from any other source. They, this year, make the astonishing offer of a pound of sweet peas for forty cents and they offer three hundred dollars (\$300.00) for a name for a new Double Sweet Pea. The Floral Guide is sent for only ten cents.

The special features of the April *Review of Reviews* are as follows: (1) The Living Greek,—his politics and progress, by Professor Manatt. With numerous portraits and illustrations. (2) Our "Civic Renaissance,"—an account of municipal reform movements in Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Washington, Baltimore, Detroit and Albany, by Albert Shaw. With twelve portraits. (3) The Foundations of Belief,—a summing up of recent discussions on the relation of science to religion, with a review of Mr. Balfour's new book, by W. T. Stead. With portraits of Balfour, Gladstone, Herbert Spencer, Haeckel and



Romanes. (4) Samuel Dana Horton,—the career, services and monetary doctrines of the eminent bimetallist, by Frederick W. Holls. The regular departments are as full and well illustrated as usual. In *The Progress of the World* will be found such subjects as these: Validity of the Income Tax; The Bond Issue and the Gold Reserve; Silver and the Next Conference; The Future of Mormonism; Party Lines in the Senate; The English Political Outlook; The German Ship-Canal; The Cuban Revolution; Japan's Position; Public Influence of American Women; College Oratory; The Cornell-Pennsylvania Debate. The other departments are admirably filled.

---

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The following books from T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, came too late for notice in this issue:

*Introduction to the New Testament.* By F. Godet, D. D. Particular Introduction I, The Epistles of St. Paul. Translated from the French by William Affleck, B. D.

*How to Read the Prophets.* By Rev. Buchanan Blake, B. D. Part V, Isaiah and the Post-Exilian Prophets.

*From the Exile to the Advent.* By Rev. William Fairweather, M. A.

# Reading Railroad

"THE ROYAL ROUTE."

---

NEW AND DIRECT LINE  
TO AND FROM . . . .

**GETTYSBURG.**

---

Fast, Frequent and Superbly Equipped Train Service Between

**NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA,**

Allentown, Pottsville, Williamsport, Reading, Harrisburg and Interior Pennsylvania Points, with through connections to and from all parts of the Middle States, New England and the West.

Visitors to America's Greatest Battlefield can obtain through tickets and baggage checks, via this new and most picturesque route, at all principal stations and ticket offices throughout the country.

I. A. SWEIGARD,  
General Superintendent.

C. G. HANCOCK,  
Gen. Pass. Agent.

---

## Western Maryland R. R.

---

**Mountain Scenery unsurpassed.**

**Good road bed.**

**Easy riding.**

**Well-furnished Coaches.**

**Courteous and obliging train hands.**